

James E. Peck, to be postmaster at Jordan, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

Jetur R. Rogers, to be postmaster at Southampton, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

Gervas H. Kerr, to be postmaster at Pelham Manor, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

William H. Bain, to be postmaster at Canajoharie, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

W. Scott Siver, to be postmaster at Chittenango, in the county of Madison and State of New York.

Herbert W. Davis, to be postmaster at Falconer, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

Justus B. Abbott, to be postmaster at Gouverneur, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

George H. Keeler, to be postmaster at Hammondsport, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Nelson E. Ransom, to be postmaster at Little Falls, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York.

Peter H. Vosburgh, to be postmaster at Matteawan, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York.

William J. H. Parker, to be postmaster at Moravia, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York.

William Witte, jr., to be postmaster at Roslyn, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Michael Halligan, to be postmaster at Rouses Point, in the county of Clinton and State of New York.

Charles C. Horton, to be postmaster at Silver Creek, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Ernest C. Eddy, to be postmaster at Fargo, in the county of Cass and State of North Dakota.

OHIO.

W. B. Jones, to be postmaster at Delaware, in the county of Delaware and State of Ohio.

William H. Surlis, to be postmaster at East Liverpool, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

Walter B. Johnson, to be postmaster at Fredericktown, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio.

Edmund F. Moore, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

George E. McDonald, to be postmaster at Minerva, in the county of Stark and State of Ohio.

Joseph G. Gest, to be postmaster at Washington Court-House, in the county of Fayette and State of Ohio.

Tanner R. Snowden, to be postmaster at Wellsville, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

VIRGINIA.

John R. Waddy, to be postmaster at Norfolk, in the county of Norfolk and State of Virginia.

William H. Boyenton, to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Elizabeth City and State of Virginia.

WASHINGTON.

F. A. Tarr, to be postmaster at Montesano, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington.

WISCONSIN.

George W. Smith, to be postmaster at Eau Claire, in the county of Eau Claire and State of Wisconsin.

George H. Dodge, to be postmaster at Arcadia, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin.

Nicholas T. Martin, to be postmaster at Mineral Point, in the county of Iowa and State of Wisconsin.

James T. Brownlee, to be postmaster at Mondovi, in the county of Buffalo and State of Wisconsin.

Gustav A. Albrecht, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin.

Hervey L. Coe, to be postmaster at Port Washington, in the county of Ozaukee and State of Wisconsin.

William H. Landolt, to be postmaster at Wauwatosa, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Fred M. Griswold, to be postmaster at Lakemills, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

Charles H. Maynard, to be postmaster at Sheboygan, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin.

Byron H. Sanford, to be postmaster at Sheboygan Falls, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin.

Cornelius E. Donovan, to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Jefferson and State of Wisconsin.

Byron Fairbanks, to be postmaster at West Bend, in the county of Washington and State of Wisconsin.

Leopold E. Jochem, to be postmaster at Cedarburg, in the county of Ozaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Robert Downend, to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Polk and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 4, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and, pending that, I desire to make some arrangement about closing general debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and, pending that, states that he wants some understanding as to the closing of general debate.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that general debate close on this bill at 3 o'clock, and that two hours be controlled by myself and one hour by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS].

The SPEAKER. And pending that motion, the gentleman asks that general debate close at 3 o'clock; two hours to be controlled by himself and one hour by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16990, the Post-Office appropriation bill.

Mr. LOUD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] such time as he may desire within the hour.

Mr. BROMWELL. It has been stated, Mr. Chairman, that a drowning man, or a man with death imminent, makes a review of all his life, recalls all of his good deeds and his bad ones, but particularly his bad ones, and that his whole life passes in panorama in a very few seconds. I do not know whether that is the feeling which actuates me this morning in making a retrospect, in view of the fact that after the 4th of March next I shall cease to hold my membership of this House, and particularly my connection with the Post-Office Committee, of which I have been permitted to be a member for the last eight years.

But, as a matter of fact, it has been of some interest to me to review briefly some of the legislation that has been had by this great Post-Office Committee and Congress upon matters which have been brought before it, and particularly to note the wonderful advance that has been made in the post-office service during that short period of time.

It has become so much a matter of course to the people of this country to take for granted the magnificent prosperity which has come to it since the Republican party came into power—the wonderful advance in commerce and manufactures—that this great index of trade and commerce, the Post-Office Department, should be taken in its advancement as a matter of course, and very few of us can realize without resort to figures, comparing the statistics of the Post-Office Department at different periods, what this great advance has been within the short period of four terms, or eight years of this Congress.

I have before me the report of the Postmaster-General of the United States for 1894-95, and also the report of the present Postmaster-General for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1902, and I wish briefly to make some extracts from these reports, to summarize this wonderful development of the postal service.

I find from the report of the Postmaster-General for 1895 that the receipts from postal revenue for the year ending July 1, 1895, were \$76,171,090.09; for the year ending July 1, 1902, the receipts from the same source were \$119,958,229.40, showing an increase in seven years of \$43,787,139.31, or a total increase of 57 per cent; that the receipts from the money-order business for the year ending July 1, 1895, were \$812,038.19; for the year ending July 1, 1902, they were \$1,889,817.86, or an increase of \$1,077,779.67, being 133 per cent of increase in the seven years; that the total revenue from all sources for the year ending July 1, 1895, was \$76,983,128.19, while the receipts from all for the year ending July 1, 1902, were \$121,848,047.26, being an increase of \$44,864,919.07, representing an increase of 58 per cent.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the receipts have increased in this manner, so also have the expenditures, although not in the same ratio. The expenditures for the year ending July 1, 1895, were \$86,790,172.82; for the year ending July 1, 1902, \$124,785,697.07, an increase of \$37,995,524.25, being an increase of 43 per cent.

A still more striking comparison will be seen when we take the expenditures as I have already given them for 1902, and compare

them with the receipts for 1895. The deficit then for the current year would be \$47,802,568.88.

For a better comparison of these figures I have selected the five largest items of expenditure, comparing the expenditures for the year ending July 1, 1895, with those of the year ending July 1, 1902, upon the items I shall name.

It cost us for transporting the mails on railroads for the year ending July 1, 1895, \$26,429,747.21. The same item cost us last year \$34,700,000, or an increase of \$8,270,252.79.

Compensation to postmasters: For the year ending July 1, 1895, \$16,079,508.40; for the last year, \$20,783,919.97, or an increase of \$4,703,411.57.

For free-delivery service: In 1895, \$12,139,092.27; for the past year, \$17,123,310.90, or an increase of \$4,984,218.63.

For compensation of clerks in post-offices: In 1895, \$9,414,135.67; for last year, \$14,434,047.70, an increase of \$5,019,912.03.

For compensation of railway mail clerks: In 1895, \$7,103,025.30; in 1902, \$10,264,588.38, or an increase of \$3,161,563.08.

The difference in the conditions of the country may well be illustrated by quoting from the opening paragraphs of the Postmaster-General's report for these two years. The Postmaster-General in his report for 1895 says:

It will be seen that the financial and industrial depression, which has seriously affected the revenues of the postal service for the past two years and disappointed the estimates of my predecessors, extended far enough into the fiscal year of 1895 to make an unusually wide gap between revenues and expenditures. It is gratifying, however, to report that a large part of this deficiency occurred in the first quarter of the year, and that since then the revenues of the Department have reflected the general returning prosperity of the country.

The report of the Postmaster-General for this year, at the bottom of page 4, is as follows:

The increase in the postal revenues not only attests the wonderful prosperity of the people and the activity of business interests throughout the country, but also indicates that the extension of postal facilities, carefully directed, result sooner or later in increased receipts and diminished deficits. With phenomenal growth of population and other favoring conditions, the mail matter poured into the post-offices has rapidly helped to lessen the percentage of deficit. Despite largely increased expenditures, the revenues gradually approximate the expenses after each added outlay has marked a new standard.

As a further illustration of this wonderful growth, in 1895 the number of domestic money orders issued in the United States was 22,031,120. Last year the number was 40,474,327, showing an increase of 18,443,207, or nearly 90 per cent. The value of domestic money orders issued in 1895 was \$156,709,089.77, while in 1902 it was \$313,551,279, showing an increase of \$156,842,189.23, or more than double during the seven years. The number of foreign money orders issued in the United States in 1895 was 909,278. In 1902 it was 1,311,111, showing an increase of 401,833, or about 44 per cent. The amount in value of foreign money orders issued in 1895 was \$12,906,485.67; in 1902, \$22,974,473, an increase of \$10,067,987.33, or about 80 per cent increase. The number of paid registered-mail pieces in 1895 was 11,744,525; in 1902, 19,628,143, or an increase of 7,883,618, about 70 per cent in the seven years.

Mr. Chairman, this growth of the post-office service is also shown in the wonderful increase in the number of post-office employees. In 1895 the number of post-office clerks was about 13,000, exact figures not being available from the report. In 1902 the number of post-office clerks was 19,887, or an increase of something over 6,000. In 1895 the number of carriers was 12,714; in 1902 the number of carriers was 17,785, or an increase of over 5,000. The Railway Mail Service employees in 1895 numbered 7,045; in 1902 9,731, an increase of 700. Of rural free-delivery service employees, in 1895 there was none; in 1902, about 12,000, the exact figures not being available. It is also interesting, Mr. Chairman, to notice that our postal service during that time has been extended to Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Alaska, to say nothing of the Cuban service while it lasted, and the Philippine service, which is independent of the departmental service here. In 1895 we had but one short line of pneumatic-tube service in the city of Philadelphia; I think less than half a mile in length. During the next year we shall have the tube service in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Chicago, and St. Louis.

The most wonderful, perhaps, of the developments that have taken place in this service during these seven years has been the installation and growth of the rural free-delivery service. In the report of the Postmaster-General for 1895, page 8, he says:

The amount appropriated by Congress, \$20,000, to test the feasibility of establishing rural free delivery was not expended during the last fiscal year, the Department not being able to devise a plan by which a satisfactory test could be made with this small allowance. To establish rural free delivery throughout the United States would involve, it is believed, an expenditure annually of not less than \$20,000,000, and the revenues of the Government, not less than the revenues of the Department, are imposing the most rigid economy and the necessity for refraining, as far as possible, from uncertain experiments.

If, with full knowledge of the cost of free delivery in towns and villages and in the country, the people's representatives shall desire to undertake it, this Department will omit no effort to make it a thorough success; but under present conditions and present revenues, it believes it both duty and policy

to extend and improve the postal facilities of all the people through the expansion and improvement of the existing system. For myself, personally, I may say that I assumed control of this Department too late in the fiscal year to take any action under this appropriation. Should Congress see fit to make it available for the current year, I will make the experiment ordered by the best tests I can devise.

The Postmaster-General, alluding to this same service, on page 6 of his report for the current year, says:

Rural free-delivery service has become an established fact. It is no longer in the experimental stage, and undoubtedly Congress will continue to increase the appropriation for this service until all the people of the country are reached where it is thickly enough settled to warrant it.

Another great advance which has been made by the Post-Office authorities has been in carrying into effect the provisions of what was known from time to time as the Loud bill. Congress after Congress attempted to put into definite legislation the provisions of the so-called Loud bill for the purpose of diminishing the deficit of the Post-Office appropriation and also for correcting the abuses of the second-class mail privilege.

This bill occasionally passed one House or the other, but never was enacted into law. The Post-Office authorities, finding that Congress would not give definite and specific legislation upon this subject, assumed the responsibility, upon the theory that existing law gave them sufficient control over the mail matter of the country to decide what was and what was not intended to be included in the second-class mail privilege, and, thanks to the heroic efforts of the Third Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Madden, many of these abuses have been corrected, and it has been done so quietly and yet so effectively that very little general protest has arisen throughout the country. It is to be hoped that Congress will in the future strengthen the hands of the Department, in order that this great privilege given to the newspapers and to legitimate publications may not be abused by the impositions which have been practiced upon it in the past.

In the present bill, in addition to the ordinary appropriations, are included a number of new items. I will briefly allude to them.

In section 2 of the bill there is a provision for amending section 6 of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1886, and other purposes. The special object of this particular amendment is to withdraw the restriction upon the amount that may be earned by the messenger boys who carry special-delivery letters. This limit has been entirely removed, as it has been found that those who are most diligent and industrious reach the limit fixed by law before the month expires, and then have to waste the rest of the month. As the bill is proposed to be amended, it places it in the discretion of the postmaster to use any of the messenger force and pay them according to existing law without reference to any fixed amount as a limit.

The next amendment is for the purpose of placing the protection of the penal laws upon the boxes used by the star routes. Heretofore there has been very little delivery of mail to boxes along the lines of star routes. That service has been a through service from one point to another. But the Second Assistant Postmaster-General has recently introduced boxes similar to the rural free-delivery boxes along star routes, and in the contracts which are now made there is a provision that the star-route contractor shall deliver to those boxes. It seemed, however, that there was no definite provision of law by which deceptions on these boxes could be prevented, and this amendment is merely to correct that omission.

Section 3 is for the purpose of extending the protection of the law to the special-delivery messenger, such as is extended to carriers and other post-office officials.

Section 4 is an important provision demanded in the interest of economy and convenience. It provides for the prepayment of mail in a manner similar to what is now in use with newspapers, paying by weight in advance and not requiring the stamping of the separate pieces of mail. It provides that mail matter of not less than 2,000 identical pieces of third or fourth class matter may be deposited without placing the stamps upon the individual pieces, but by payment in bulk in advance in the same manner as the newspapers are now mailed.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Does that provision meet with the approbation of the Department?

Mr. BROMWELL. It not only meets with the approbation of the Department, but the provision in the bill was drawn by the Department. It makes no change whatever in the rate of postage. The same amount of postage is paid for each individual piece mailed, but instead of being paid by stamping each one, a pound of these identical pieces may be weighed up, the number to the pound ascertained, and the rate paid at 1 cent for 2 ounces, just the same as now.

Mr. STEELE. My object in asking was because it seemed to me it would require greater surveillance to guard against fraud when they were thrown in in bulk like that.

Mr. BROMWELL. The plan is this: A publisher or a business man may send 2,000 of these identical pieces to the post-office. A pound of them will be selected out and weighed and the number of pieces in that pound counted. Now, say it runs 100 pieces to the pound. Then the postage will be paid on the number of pounds at the rate of the postage on those individual pieces, being 100 to the pound.

Mr. STEELE. Suppose this publisher should send 2,000 pounds through the post-office and they were weighed, and then he would send 500 pounds direct to the car, where he might have an arrangement with the railway mail clerk, and he should dump that 500 pounds right in with the 2,000 pounds?

Mr. BROMWELL. The same fraud could be perpetrated by the newspapers, and yet there is no complaint of anything of that kind being done.

Mr. STEELE. I was asking for information. It seems to me that there might be danger of fraud arising from collusion with the railway mail clerks.

Mr. LOUD. I will say to the gentleman that the system has been in operation for years with reference to newspapers, and all this matter must go through the post-office.

Mr. BROMWELL. The object of the provision is not only to serve the convenience of those who mail this matter, but as an economy to the service, in that it does not require the force of clerks to stamp all this amount of mail, and it is practically just the same as with newspapers.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the principal provisions that are recommended in the bill. There are two other things that have been done, largely through the instrumentality of the Post-Office Committee, and more particularly through the efforts of the chairman of that committee, during the last eight years, which has resulted in a great improvement of the service. One of these is the segregation of the various items in the bill. It was formerly the custom to appropriate lump sums, leaving the distribution of the items in the discretion of the Post-Office Department. The system of segregation or separation of these items and a separate appropriation for each of the various items in the bill was commenced by the committee some years ago, and, as I say, largely through the instrumentality of the chairman of the committee, by which now the appropriation bill not only appropriates the amounts necessary for each branch of the service, but specifically devotes that particular part of the appropriation which is to go to the different classes or items of expenditure.

The other great improvement, Mr. Chairman, has been the change that has been gradually taking place in the classification of the various post-office employees. We all remember how five or six years ago three classification bills were presented to this House, and were being pressed by the post-office clerks, the carriers, and the railway mail clerks. All of them appealed more or less to the members of this House, and all were being urgently demanded by the associations representing these bodies of post-office employees. By a process of gradual increases these classification bills have been carried into effect, with one exception, and that is taking the promotion of post-office clerks out of the merit system. As it is now, the carriers are the only force in the service which get their promotion merely by longevity or length of service. The railway mail clerks get their promotions as the result of continuous record and thorough examination at short intervals. The post-office clerks get their promotion as a result of meritorious service in the various post-offices, the matter being largely in the discretion, perhaps entirely so, of the postmaster at each office; and in this way he is enabled to select those clerks who have done their duty faithfully to the exclusion of those who have been negligent. Those who have done well are promoted; from those who have neglected their duty promotion is withheld.

Mr. Chairman, I can not refrain at this time, and I think I but express the sentiment of my colleagues on the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads when I say to this House and to the country that the services that have been rendered by the chairman of this committee during the last eight years have been beyond computation. I intend no flattery when I say that it is the universal judgment of every member of this House with whom I have spoken that there is to-day no man in the United States who has a more thorough knowledge of postal matters in all its details than the distinguished chairman of the Post-Office Committee. I think I voice the sentiment of every member of this House when I say that no man who has ever been at the head of that great committee has displayed more industry and more ability. I think I voice the sentiment of everyone who knows this distinguished gentleman, whether member of this House or not, when I say that there has never been a more honest, straightforward, conscientious devotion to the public service than has been rendered by Mr. LOUD as chairman of this committee [great general applause], and I know that whatever may have been the cause, whatever may have induced the constituents of this gentleman to decline to return him to the next Congress, I know that this House has suf-

fered a loss and the country has suffered a loss from which it will take a long time to recover.

Mr. STEELE. I would say something about his courageous conduct as you went along there.

Mr. BROMWELL. That goes without saying with any man who has witnessed the course of the chairman of the Post-Office Committee, when advocating unpopular measures, frequently in the face of opposition, going down to defeat, but nevertheless standing up here courageously, as the gentleman from Indiana has suggested, doing his duty whether in the majority or minority on all subjects presented from his committee and upon all the subjects that have engrossed the attention of the House. I think that this tribute is due to this distinguished gentleman; and I say that in voicing it as my own personal sentiment I but repeat what is the universal sentiment of this House. [Loud general applause.]

Mr. LOUD. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY].

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not in his seat. On Saturday last I asked the gentleman from Mississippi this question:

The gentleman has mentioned the name of that great statesman Thomas Jefferson, and I want to ask him if Jefferson, about 1814, if I recollect right, did not write a letter recanting all his former free-trade theories and say that new conditions had arisen which led him to modify his opinions on that subject which he had theretofore expressed?

In reply to that Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi said:

I do not think he ever did. I never heard of his suffering from temporary insanity in his life. I do not think it ever occurred. I think the gentleman is mistaken. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, in Volume VI of Jefferson's Complete Works I find a letter under date of January 9, 1816, addressed to Benjamin Austin, esq., and in this letter he says:

You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more candor, but within the thirty years which have since elapsed how are circumstances changed! We were then in peace. Our independent place among nations was acknowledged. A commerce which offered the raw material in exchange for the same material after receiving the last touch of industry was worthy of welcome to all nations. It was expected that those especially to whom manufacturing industry was important would cherish the friendship of such customers by every favor, by every inducement, and particularly cultivate their peace by every act of justice and friendship.

Under this prospect the question seemed legitimate, whether, with such an immensity of unimproved land, courting the hand of husbandry, the industry of agriculture or that of manufacture would add most to the national wealth. And the doubt was entertained, on this consideration chiefly, that to the labor of the husbandman a vast addition is made by the spontaneous energies of the earth on which it was employed. For one grain of wheat committed to the earth she renders twenty, thirty, and even fifty fold, whereas to the labor of the manufacturer nothing is added. Pounds of flax in his hands yield, on the contrary, but pennyweights of lace. This exchange, too, laborious as it might seem, what a field did it promise for the occupations of the ocean; what a nursery for that class of citizens who were to exercise and maintain our equal rights on that element! This was the state of things in 1785, when the "Notes on Virginia" were first printed; when, the ocean being open to all nations, and their common right in it acknowledged and exercised under regulation sanctioned by the assent and usage of all, it was thought that the doubt might claim some consideration.

But who in 1785 could foresee the rapid depravity which was to render the close of that century the disgrace of the history of man? Who could have imagined that the two most distinguished in the rank of nations for science and civilization would have suddenly descended from that honorable eminence, and setting at defiance all those moral laws established by the Author of nature between nation and nation, as between man and man, would cover earth and sea with robberies and piracies, merely because strong enough to do it with temporal impunity, and that under this disbandment of nations from social order we should have been despoiled of a thousand ships and have thousands of our citizens reduced to Algerine slavery.

Yet all this has taken place. One of these nations interdicted to our vessels all harbors of the globe without having first proceeded to some one of hers, there paid a tribute proportioned to the cargo, and obtained her license to proceed to the port of destination. The other declared them to be lawful prize if they had touched at the port or been visited by a ship of the enemy nation. Thus were we completely excluded from the ocean. Compare this state of things with that of '85 and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we did not then believe, that there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist.

The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. Shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of these; experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort; and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not soon have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has wielded it.

If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply, the question of '85 will then recur. Will our surplus labor be then most beneficially employed in the culture of the earth or in the fabrications of art? We have time yet for consideration, before that question will press upon us, and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist, for in so complicated a science as political economy no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances, and for their contraries. Inattention to this is what has called for this explanation, which reflection would have rendered unnecessary with the candid, while nothing will do it with those who use the former opinion only as a stalking-horse to cover their

disloyal propensities to keep us in eternal vassalage to a foreign and unfriendly people.

My learned and distinguished friend from Mississippi, whom we all honor—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SIBLEY. My time is so limited I do not want it taken up by interruptions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I simply want to ask the gentleman if he thinks the same reasons exist to-day for the protective tariff that existed in 1816, provided they did exist then?

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who think that the world stands forever and eternally still. It is moving on. The same conditions do not exist; you can not keep them so if you desire. My friend from Mississippi said he could not believe it possible that Thomas Jefferson had ever written such language because he never suffered from temporary insanity.

I do not think he ever suffered from temporary insanity; I consider him one of the wise men, one of the ornaments of all the ages—an American in whom every citizen of this country can take a just pride. I reverence his memory. I have tried to be something of a student of his teachings. But I think that in his earlier period, when the ambitions of life were pressing upon him and political power was within his grasp, or seemed to be, he might hold one opinion, but when he had reached the ripe maturity of age, when ambitions were behind him, when he was looking only to the future welfare, prosperity, and happiness of the American people, in that letter of 1816 he gave out the rule of conduct safest to follow.

I shall not attempt, Mr. Chairman, with only twenty minutes allotted me at this time, to make an argument concerning the trusts. I believe that question is coming up later, and if I can get the time I will make a few remarks on that occasion. But my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated the other day, if I recall his remarks aright, that there were but three methods possible under which a trust can exist: First, to reduce the price of the product purchased from the producer of that product. Is that correct? I do not wish to mistake the gentleman's position. Second, by reducing the wages of labor; or, third, by increasing the price to the consumer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Or decreasing the volume of labor.

Mr. SIBLEY. Or decreasing the volume of labor. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is not a gentleman who is familiar with any of our great manufacturing centers, our great industrial works that we have all through the northern section of this country, who does not recognize that the gentleman is mistaken in that. Through the ability to set certain men to perform this labor and certain men to perform that the cost of production is diminished, precisely as the factory can diminish the cost and the price of my coat from what it was when my mother used to spin and weave it for me when I was a boy. The day of individualism is passed, and the day of concentration of effort, for the accomplishment of great purposes, has come. Individualism, competition, is destructive; it is war. Cooperation of forces is peace and is a guaranty of greater prosperity and greater happiness and blessings to the human race.

Why, sir, in the testimony taken before the Industrial Commission one witness stated—and this was not with relation to a great corporation as corporations go to-day—that the Federal Steel Company in their combination have saved annually \$500,000 in freight from cross-shipment. Suppose they locate one factory in the South, another in Baltimore, another in New England—three separate factories—can Boston compete with your trade in Mississippi or South Carolina, and all competing at some point yonder? Every combination of capital that has increased the price to the consumer has been forced to close its doors; and the record of every successful combination of capital is a diminished price to the consumer.

You say that prices are higher. Surely! But where do you wish to make them lower? Formerly you got four cents and a fraction for your cotton; now you get 8.31 cents. You do not want cotton lower? In Pennsylvania oil sold under Mr. Cleveland's Administration for 50 cents a barrel; to-day the producers of that petroleum get \$1.50 a barrel. Do we want oil lower? Wages have been increased in every calling where human endeavor and brawn and brain and muscle are exerted. Labor does not want a cheaper price. And you will find that you can never have the price below a just margin of profit unless labor suffers.

One effect of combination is the cheapening of the cost of administration. I know of one concern where certain general officers do the work which formerly required three times the number; thus the cost of administration is lessened. In the same way the ability to manufacture more cheaply is developed. But I am not going into the trust question at this time.

Gentlemen on that side seem to be afraid of combined capital.

You say it is dangerous. How much is dangerous? Let us fix a limit. Is it a million dollars, or ten million dollars, or a hundred million dollars, or a billion dollars? Fix the limit. Where is the danger line? My judgment is that every dollar of capital which is used by unfair means to crush competition, every dollar of capital which is used to prevent labor finding its just reward, every dollar of capital which is used to oppress the consuming public, is a wrongful dollar; but every dollar which cheapens the cost of production and extends the area through which such productions may reach the people, that gives wider employment to labor and better returns to capital, comes not as a curse, not as a menace, but as a blessing.

It is merely evolution from the lower to the higher form—from the day of individualism, when the village blacksmith was the chief artisan of the hamlet or township, when the carpenter was also the wheelwright, and the shoemaker made shoes for the whole community—to that union of labor which lessens toil and blesses all mankind. Every result of cooperation of effort, whether it be in labor or in capital, has been a blessing or should be. My friend says that the way to kill the trusts is to kill the tariff. I hold in my hand here the Democratic campaign handbook. It contains on its cover a picture of an elephant, labeled "The anatomy of the G. O. P."

This is the Republican elephant, and I find that every muscle and bone and sinew and ligament here is represented by some great combination of capital. Here at the heart is the money power. Well, I suppose that is a trust! Here are represented all the railroads and the locomotive trusts; the tail of the animal is the cordage trust and the trunk the rubber trust. There is not a single enterprise in this country which is moving and going forward, which is extending our domestic and our foreign commerce, which is not in some way represented in the anatomy of this great Republican elephant.

Gentlemen, the compiler of that book has unconsciously paid the Republican party the highest tribute that has ever been paid to it. [Applause on the Republican side.] I find that all these industries, all these great enterprises, everything which is moving forward and carrying humanity's hopes with it, is represented somewhere here. Here upon the legs in three places are marked "The tariff," "The tariff," "The tariff"—all these great enterprises standing on the tariff.

Now, you have an idea that these industries will move faster and extend up higher by performing a surgical operation on this elephant, and you propose to cut off his legs just below the body. Why, a schoolboy might think an elephant would go faster if his legs were removed, but he would have to be a pretty young schoolboy. But that is the remedy for the trusts proposed by our Democratic friends, ever forgetful of the fact that before we had trusts, known as such in the United States, they existed in England, and they have more of them there to-day than we have. I have a copy of a paper which I picked up in London which invites subscriptions to the United Laundry Trust, of London, with a capital of £500,000. There is hardly a business which is not in some way or other in a combination over in that country, and yet England, the mother of trusts, is a free-trade nation.

Mr. Chairman, this is the idea of the theorist. Away back in 1888 there arose in this country a distinguished theorist. He enunciated a doctrine which, if enacted into law, he claimed would increase our prosperity until our storehouses would be unable to contain the golden harvest which would roll into them. That man was Grover Cleveland. People could not take him at his word then, but in 1892 they did, and in 1893, with this Chamber as its theater, there was enacted on the floor of this House a national drama—I might say a national tragedy.

The closing hours of the debate upon the Wilson tariff bill had arrived. For the friends of protection, Thomas B. Reed stood there. For the champions of free trade, William L. Wilson, of West Virginia, stood yonder. They were two men marvelous in their attributes; each a credit to his country and the age which produced him; both masters of parry and of thrust; each inspired, I believe, with the highest motives of patriotism. Unfortunately for Mr. Reed, he had to confine himself to the hard and solid foundation facts. All that he could do was to show what by experience had come to this nation when a reversal of the policy of protection had taken place. But over on the other side, when the time came for Mr. Wilson to close the debate, the theorist was in command. All the illimitable spaces of the celestial universe were his, and he plucked the stars as baubles and passed them out among the membership on that side of the floor.

When he sat down, you gentlemen who were on the floor of this House at that time will recall there was a hush in this Chamber like that in the chamber of death. Then there arose a roar like unto that of rushing waters, men frantically hugged him to their breasts, men seized him and bore him upon their shoulders, among them one who has been twice a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, and marched him through the aisles

of this hall. Fact and theory had met in the arena, fact overthrown and theory triumphant. It was the apotheosis of theory; but the history of the next four years was branded as with a hissing iron into the hearts and lives of men in every hamlet in all this broad land.

Now, gentlemen, you have a theory about the tariff and you have a theory about the trusts. To-day labor is employed throughout the length and breadth of all the land. No man seeks employment to-day who does not find it at the highest wage ever received. Capital is rewarded for its daring and enterprise as never before. Labor is employed in the factory, upon the farm, and in the field, meeting the greatest recompense it ever received. This marvelous prosperity, with the furnaces pouring out their pillars of smoke by day and of fire by night, is pointing out the pathway which is leading God's chosen people of this nation from the house of industrial bondage to a land flowing with milk and honey. [Applause.]

This, Mr. Chairman, is a time when all charged with responsibility for legislation should step carefully and cautiously, as those who tread upon thin ice; for if by an injudicious policy, if by hasty or ill-advised legislation we impair our prosperity of the present moment and carry the country back into the abyss from which it has happily escaped and where the last great exponent of free trade left us, and where that man who, I think, will be your next candidate will want to take us again, I believe the American people will hold us to a strict accountability when the hysteria and the mania of the present moment concerning tariff revision and the trusts have passed away. [Applause.]

I yield back my remaining time to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly concerning some changes that I think could be made in the tariff profitably to the people of the United States and advantageously to the Republican party.

Two months ago I introduced into this House two bills—one repealing the duty on coal and meat and the other repealing the duty on hides and lumber. Those bills were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished chairman of which [Mr. PAYNE] sits near me, and in that committee they have slept the sleep of the just for two months and will continue to sleep until the close of this session. But, while the Committee on Ways and Means can put the bills to sleep, they can not put to sleep the question.

In introducing those bills I claim to be a better protectionist than the Ways and Means Committee. What, Mr. Chairman, is the theory of protection? In using a word we must not forget the thing that is represented by the word. What is the theory upon which protection in the United States of America is advocated by the Republican party? It rests upon the assumption that labor is better paid in this country than in most other countries, and that to enable American manufacturers to pay their employees such wages as are required to support them in the decent comfort which they demand, a certain amount of duty must be levied upon goods made in other lands by cheaper labor.

That is what protection rests upon and without that it can not stand at all. There is no one who does not realize that the most important thing for the people of this land is that the great mass of wage-workers should be well, satisfactorily, even highly paid.

The greatest curse and the greatest danger that could fall upon the country would be the growth of a class of pauper laborers, ill paid, ill fed, ill taught.

So the fundamental object of protection is to secure for our working people the highest degree of comfort and well-being. Now, it is evident that a provision which has for its result to make the cost of living higher for the mass of the people, undoes to some extent the good which they might derive from higher wages. There is no advantage in receiving more wages if we also raise the cost of necessaries which one buys with his wages.

The first objection made to a bill of this sort is that it must mean a general revision of the tariff, and this would result in business disturbance. I agree that a general revision of the tariff might have such results, and I do not believe the day will soon come when the Republican party would or should undertake it. But how can anyone, how can my friend on the Ways and Means Committee, say that if the duty on some specific article is found to be injurious it can not be taken off without bringing under consideration the entire tariff? Why, Mr. Chairman, what an object lesson we had not two weeks ago. There was a duty on anthracite coal—a part of the Dingley tariff just as much as any other section of that bill. There was also a duty on soft coal—a part of the Dingley tariff just as much as any other section of the tariff. In one day, in six hours, without amendment, without trouble, the duty on anthracite coal went off forever. The duty on soft coal went off for one year, and I hope forever. Was any revision of the tariff necessary to accomplish that?

Let us be rational. Do not let us say things that have no meaning. A change was made in the Dingley tariff which permanently took off the duty on anthracite coal and temporarily off from soft coal. Does any man say that business disturbances followed that change? Have bankers been alarmed? Have manufacturers been disturbed? Has there been any commotion in business interests in this country because the Congress of the United States saw fit to take off the duty on an article when that duty was deemed injurious? We can not be like the Medes and Persians, and live under laws that alter not. There is no law on the statute book that will or should for all time remain beyond the possibility of amendment. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the proper thing for the Republican party—the party in power—is, if the duty on certain articles is shown to be disadvantageous to the great mass of the community, to see that the duty is taken off.

Let us take the tax on coal. When the difference in cost between the two grades is considerable, soft coal is sure to take the place of hard coal for many uses, and lowering the price of one necessarily brings down the price of the other. Why is not it for the benefit of the community that the price of every grade of coal should be as low as possible? Does anyone really maintain that it helps a workingman to raise the price of the coal he burns? Does anyone claim that it helps the manufacturer to make more costly the coal he requires to heat his building and to generate power? In order that manufacturers may pay good wages, we must furnish them every facility for carrying on their business economically.

Mr. BOREING. I will ask the gentleman if he does not believe that the wage-earner who mines coal is as much entitled to protection as the wage-earner in clothing, shoes, and other articles used by the people?

Mr. PERKINS. Exactly the same; but coal is an article which must necessarily be used by 80,000,000 people. We must consider, not only a certain number of coal owners and coal corporations—nor even the 125,000 people who mine coal—but the 80,000,000 people in the United States of America who use it. Can one believe that it is advantageous to the people of the community or wisdom in the Republican party to keep up an impost which must be paid by the entire population on an article of primary necessity?

The object of protection is to build up our manufacturing interests, and it is of vital importance to them that the cost of coal should be as low as possible. The price of soft coal has almost doubled within a few months. Is that a good thing for manufacturers? This increase in the cost of power will seriously cripple many of them. It will diminish the amount of business they can do and the number of men they can employ.

It is argued that taking off the duty on coal will make little difference in its cost except at a time like this when prices are abnormally high. Is that any reason for keeping it on? Here is a duty which is inoperative most of the time and only operates when it does harm.

It may well be that the abolition of the duty on soft coal should be accompanied by a provision that other countries should abolish any duty they have on our coal. I do not believe there would be any trouble in obtaining such an agreement with Canada, and I have understood from large dealers in soft coal that they would view the abolition of our duty with pleasure if it was accompanied by an abolition of the duty imposed by Canada. As a result of this we might fairly expect to cheapen the cost of power for our manufacturers, and to increase the market for our coal in Canada.

I can not understand why the leaders of the Republican party think it is wise to keep this duty on. Let us suppose the question of the free entry of coal was put to a popular vote to-day. Nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand would vote in favor of taking it off. Is it good politics for us to insist in keeping it on?

This extra cost is paid by every man in the country who has a stove to cook his dinner or to keep his house warm. It is paid by every manufacturer in the country who warms his building or creates power. Who receives the benefit, if any benefit is received? A few very powerful and very rich corporations. I do not believe in any anarchistic outcry against great corporations, but when it comes to increasing their profits where they are already large, and when every cent of this increase comes out of the pockets of the entire population, that is another question. Are we to consider the interests of a few great coal operators, or are we to consider the interests of 80,000,000 people who buy coal? Let every man choose whom he will serve.

Who gets the benefit of the tax on meat? I have no feeling against the great packing companies, but surely they are not in position to demand an increase in profits already large, when these come out of the whole community. Need I say that a tax on an article absolutely necessary for health, for the ability to labor, for life itself, like meat, is always and necessarily a wrong one, no matter who gets the benefit of it.

Mr. BOREING. Is not clothing as much a necessity as meat?
 Mr. PERKINS. I can not yield to the gentleman. If I had more time I would be delighted to answer his question. It is for the interest of the community that every man who labors in the United States should have good, sufficient, and wholesome meat to eat. We do not want a laboring population such as they have in Europe, where in many countries the man who eats meat once a week is doing well. We desire that a man shall have meat to eat every day in the week.

If the cost of this is increased, who gets the benefit? Nine-tenths of the benefit goes to a few great corporations. It is contrary to popular sentiment—if not corrected will receive popular condemnation from the masses of the voters—if it is believed that any party keeps up the price of beef to the man who eats it for his dinner; and of that extra price nine-tenths goes to wealthy corporations.

Some of our friends say that this extra cost of meat is of great importance to the farmers. This is not so. I represent in part a farming community. There is not one farmer out of 500 in the county of Monroe who reaps one cent of benefit by reason of the duty on meat. There is not one farmer in a hundred in the United States of America who raises beef to sell to such an extent that the extra 2 cents would make a difference to him of \$5 a year.

How many farmers are there in the United States who fatten for the market two cattle in the course of a year? How many are there who fatten one? The vast majority do not. Taking off this tax would not appreciably affect the prosperity which the farmers of this country now enjoy; but cheap meat will benefit millions. The loss of the additional price for meat due to the tariff will harm few and help many. The tax on meat is essentially and radically wrong. It falls upon the mass of the people. It is a tax to which the poor contribute in proportion to their income a hundredfold as much as the rich. It is wrong in principle, injurious in result, and bad in politics.

Let us now consider very briefly the duty on hides. The shoe industry of the country is one of the great industries. It employs over 200,000 people. It pays out not far from \$100,000,000 in wages. If it is not entitled to protection, who is? For many years there was no duty on hides; for many years there was a small duty, and during all those years the cattle industry grew greater and greater. Manifestly it was not suffering. Finally, by the Dingley bill, a duty of 15 per cent was imposed on the hides of cattle. It is not much on a hide—perhaps \$1.50 to \$2.00—but in a manufactory where hundreds of thousands of pairs of shoes are turned out, it amounts to an appreciable item. Our manufacturers can turn out the shoes necessary for this country, I suppose, in six or eight months, running full capacity. They must have a foreign outlet, and yet the shoe manufacturer who sells his shoes abroad must compete with the one who gets his hides free.

Furthermore, in this country competition is so close that it is the testimony of shoe manufacturers that the item of additional cost in a shoe, amounting, perhaps, to 2 cents a pair—and more in cheap shoes than in expensive ones—can with difficulty be added to the wholesale price. If it can be added, the man who buys the cheap shoes has to pay for it; if it can not be added, the manufacturer, to that extent, is crippled. There are many shoe manufacturers in Rochester. It is a large industry and employs many men. Every one of them has written me that this duty interferes with the development of his business. Is protection intended to help manufacturers, or to harm them? If it is intended to harm them, keep on the duty on coal and hides. If its object is to still further develop the manufacturing interests of the country, take it off.

Again we meet with the question, Whom is it intended that protection should protect? The additional price of hides is paid by one of our greatest industries in the country, and one that employs hundreds of thousands of men. Who reaps the benefit of it? Nearly all of it, and perhaps all of it, necessarily goes to the great packers. Their business has not been so unprofitable that it needs any special protection. Cattle are usually sold by the pound "on the hoof." Does anyone believe that the owner of the cattle receives any more because the dealer, by reason of this duty, is able to get a few more cents for each hide? I have not been able to find anything that shows that this is the fact. On the other hand, the statistics show that the reverse of this is the truth. I find among the figures that were collected by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS, the prices paid for cattle and hides for many years.

In 1893, for example, steers were selling for \$6 per 100 pounds. That is the price the cattle raiser and the farmer got. At that time hides were selling at 9 cents a pound. Seven years later hides were selling at 13 cents a pound. Had the price of cattle gone up? Not one cent. They were still selling at \$6 per 100 pounds. In other words, every cent of the additional profit that resulted from the sale of hides between 9 cents and 13 cents went to the man who sold the hides; not to the man who raises the cattle, but to the man who buys the cattle, slaughters them,

takes off the hide, sells the meat to the butcher, and the hide to the shoe manufacturer.

The statistics during seven years show that there is no connection between the varying price at which cattle sell on the hoof and the varying price that hides are sold for. Common sense shows it without any statistics. When a man sells a steer for a hundred dollars, he does not add on a dollar or twelve shillings because hides are selling a little higher in the New York market than they would sell if there was not a 15 per cent duty on them. To call this protection is a gross misnomer. It only results in raising the profits of a very few men at the cost of a great industry. If this is the way we interpret protection, I do not believe that the protective tariff has many years of life before it. He is the true friend of that system who is ready to modify any portion of the tariff law that lessens the actual wages of labor by increasing the cost of living, or which injures manufacturing interests by increasing the cost of manufacture.

So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for taking off the tax which, instead of helping, harms the shoe industries of my own district, the shoe industries of the New England States, the shoe industries of the whole land. A duty which is injurious to them is not the protection to American industries which I have understood was the doctrine of the Republican party. Thirteen years ago Mr. Blaine said that to take hides from the free list would yield a profit to the butcher only, the last man who needed it, and that its only effect on the farmer would be that he would have to pay more for his children's shoes. What Mr. Blaine prophesied history has verified.

I can not go into detail as to the duty on lumber, but the motives of those who defend it are past finding out. We have from every side laments that our forests are being cut off too fast. Everyone knows that this is so. The States and the General Government are spending millions to preserve the forests as a means of water supply, and yet, on the other hand, we say that our people must not use lumber from other countries, and we insist that all the lumber that goes into American buildings shall be cut in American forests. As a result of this policy not only our forests are being destroyed, but the house of the laboring man, to improve whose condition is the object of our protective laws, costs more than it otherwise would. This seems to me bad politics as well as bad legislation. The lumber of this country, as everybody knows, is practically owned by a small number of exceedingly rich men and corporations. The lumber that is used in this country is consumed by every man who builds a house.

The return of the Democratic party to power would be a misfortune, and I should not fear it unless it came by reason of Republican mistakes. If our friends on the other side succeed again, it will not be as the result of Democratic wisdom, but of Republican folly.

The people are paying more for coal than they like to, and they find a duty on it that we will not repeal. The duty on hides and lumber injures important interests, and we keep it in force. That is not the way to get votes. We are kept in because people are afraid of what the Democrats will do, but we can not count on this forever. If we do not change some things in our tariff system, sooner or later others will be elected who will do it for us.

Consider the articles on which we ask that the duty should be repealed—coal and meat, hides and lumber. Does anyone think that business interests would be disturbed because manufacturers got their coal cheaper and workmen bought their meat for less money? Would Armour & Co. go out of business if they made \$1.50 less on the hides of the cattle they slaughter?

Some one said the other day that the Ways and Means Committee were sitting on the safety valve of the tariff. If they sit there too long the steam will accumulate until the safety valve bursts and the Ways and Means Committee will go up with it.

I am willing to vote for measures as a result of which the workingman can buy more cheaply the coal he burns in his fire and the meat that is cooked in his kitchen; which will enable our manufacturers to sell more shoes abroad, and our farmers and clerks to buy more cheaply shoes at home; which will help the artisan to build a better house for less money. As he sits in his comfortable room before his warm fire and digests his beefsteak he will resolve to vote for those who voted for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of my friend and colleague from an adjoining district of New York. He says we can go into the consideration of his bills without bringing before the House a general revision of the tariff, because we were able in six hours to pass through both Houses a

bill suspending the duties on coal for a year and to remove the duty on anthracite. He does not know of the three weeks of work to prepare the way in the House and in the Senate for an emergency measure suspending the duty on coal. Every member of the House and Senate knows that if one of his bills sought its way through the House or through the Senate it would be open to amendment on every schedule of the Dingley tariff.

Mr. PERKINS. Could not we have a rule?

Mr. PAYNE. We could have a rule in the House, but they do not have any rules in the Senate, if the gentleman can understand—

Mr. PERKINS. I understand that thoroughly.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman says the duty on coal affects every consumer in the United States. I did not suppose there was a man that believed any such proposition as that. With our abundant coal fields producing more coal, both anthracite and bituminous, than any other nation on the face of the earth, producing all the coal, substantially, that is consumed in the United States, the tariff makes no difference save to the coal that is mined—

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PAYNE. Not out of my five minutes—save to the coal that is mined on the Pacific coast. There it only preserves the market for coal to our people and for our miners that go down into the mines, the general price being fixed by competition in the country.

He says that the farmers of Monroe County did not get any benefit from the high price of meat that we had during the past year. I do not know that they are different there from what they are in the almost adjoining county of Cayuga. I know the farmers in my county reaped the benefit from the high prices, and they were boasting to me of the high prices they were getting for their fattened steers when they took them into the market last summer. The tariff on meat cut no figure in the high price of beef during last summer. The 2 cents a pound was but a beggarly amount compared with the great advance made in meat. Why this advance? Because of the shortness of the corn crop, because of the few beef cattle there were to supply the demand. But when things are normal the 2 cents a pound simply helps to preserve the market for the farmers of the United States along the Canadian border, and if my friend came in here with his bill he would find that those representing the farming constituencies who were shrewd enough to get something of the advance that was made in meat during the last summer would want to amend some of the tariff schedules which are so sacred to my friend from New York.

Now, I do not say that the Dingley tariff is sacred; I do not say but that at some time it should be amended. When the time comes that the benefits to accrue from a revision of that tariff, going into other schedules so as to make a perfectly harmonious whole, when the benefits outweigh the stoppage of trade and manufacture, and the paralysis to business that will come of a general revision of the tariff, the Republican party will take up that duty and perform it for the benefit of the people of this country, always along the lines of protection to our own industries, and in the interest of the wage-earners of the United States. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7166. An act granting an increase of pension to Fanny Farmer;

S. 7053. An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States; and

S. 6968. An act granting the Central Arizona Railway Company a right of way for railroad purposes through the San Francisco Mountains Forest Reserve, in the Territory of Arizona.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of William M. Bird, James F. Redding, Henry F. Welch, and others;

H. R. 7007. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Maj. William Kendall; and

H. R. 15198. An act defining what shall constitute and providing for assessments on oil mining claims.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 15747) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by George A. Bartlett, disbursing clerk, in favor of Fannie T. Sayles, executrix, and others.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate bill No. 7124.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16604) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4722) for the erection of a building for the use and accommodation of the Department of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 7659. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes."

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

[Mr. GRIGGS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to rearrange these remarks and to insert some tables.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to rearrange and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee informally rose.

RETURN OF A BILL TO SENATE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request of the Senate; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate S. 2174.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday, January 31, while I was addressing the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] asked me a question, which I will now read, together with the reply thereto:

Mr. SIBLEY. The gentleman has mentioned the name of that great statesman, Thomas Jefferson. I want to ask him if Jefferson, about 1814, if I recollect right, did not write a letter recanting all his former free-trade theories and say that new conditions had arisen which led him to modify his opinions on that subject which he had theretofore expressed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not think he ever did. I never heard of his suffering from temporary insanity in his life; I do not think it ever occurred. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is right hard in the presence of the roar of Niagara to think, and it was perhaps a little difficult for the House this morning, while the gentleman from Pennsylvania was delivering one of his characteristic speeches, to think coolly and impartially when he undertook to read a letter from Mr. Jefferson which he said supported the contention of his question the other day, and which, by the way, does not support it in any particular whatsoever. I think this difficulty must have occurred, because after he read parts of Mr. Jefferson's letter the Republican side applauded. My friend from Pennsylvania is a very skillful debater. It is said that when you want to teach a man how to be a skillful fencer you ought to teach him to exchange foils during the fencing and to exchange partners and antagonists also. My friend has fenced upon so many sides of so many different questions that I do not know a man in the Union who ought to be more skillful than he. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

I remember when he stood on this side and fenced with us how we loved his rapier stroke. I remember that when he was a Populist how the Populists admired him as one of the greatest new-found statesmen of a new and promising era. And now, when I see him in the central aisle and his Republican brethren gathering about him and applauding the reading of a letter for the purpose of showing something which it does not show, I can not but admire his ability, his ingenuity, and his skillfulness. The gentleman says that Mr. Jefferson had written a letter in which he "recanted all of his free-trade theories," and this morning he produced a letter written to Benjamin Austin from Monticello on January 9, 1816, and there is not one word in the letter from the beginning to the end of it recanting a single "free-trade theory" that Mr. Jefferson had ever entertained.

The letter only goes thus far, that Mr. Jefferson proposed a remedy for a then existing emergency in the life of the American people, and that remedy is this, that the people "will keep pace" with him "in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price." This was Jefferson's method of "encouraging manufactures." He does not even hint at a protective tariff or

any sort of governmental action. His plan is characteristically Jeffersonian and individualistic. There is not one word in this letter, there is not one word in any utterance of Mr. Jefferson anywhere, from the beginning of his life to the end of it, proposing to put a tax upon imports into the United States for the purpose of protecting manufactures. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And that is not all. Mr. Jefferson was then writing in reply to some strictures that had been passed upon him because of opinions uttered in his notes on Virginia, in 1785. In that book he had expressed this opinion, that our surplus labor after a while had better be turned to the sea rather than to manufactures, and had given his reasons for believing that. He changed his opinion upon that point of our surplus labor being not devoted to manufactures, and upon that point only—both utterances were purely academic and had no reference to a tariff—and he said this, after admitting that he had thought otherwise in 1785:

But who in 1785 could foresee the rapid depravity which was to render the close of that century the disgrace of the history of man? Who could have imagined that the two most distinguished in the rank of nations, for science and civilization, would have suddenly descended from that honorable eminence, and setting at defiance all those moral laws established by the author of nature between nation and nation, as between man and man, would cover earth and sea with robberies and piracies, merely because strong enough to do it with temporal impunity; and that under this disbandment of nations from social order, we should have been despoiled of a thousand ships, and have thousands of our citizens reduced to Algerine slavery. Yet all this has taken place. One of these nations interdicted to our vessels all harbors of the globe without having first proceeded to some one of hers, there paid a tribute proportioned to the cargo, and obtained her license to proceed to the port of destination. The other declared them to be lawful prize if they had touched at the port or been visited by a ship of the enemy nation. Thus were we completely excluded from the ocean. Compare this state of things with that of '85 and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we did not then believe, and there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist

A free field and an equal opportunity that means, or nothing.

The former question is suppressed, or, rather, assumes a new form: Shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns.

He merely is no longer "against" going into "domestic manufactures," but thinks it advisable to begin to build them up by buying, where possible, goods of home manufacture. I said here the other day that the longer I lived the more I loved the character and the more I admired the magnificent prescience and foresight of Thomas Jefferson, the sage of Monticello. I knew that with his peculiar intellect and his political character, his habits of thought and trend of thought, although nobody can pretend to keep in mind all he ever wrote, he had "never suffered from temporary insanity" or mental aberration, and had never denied the grand old Jeffersonian doctrine of an exactly free and equal opportunity to all men upon the surface of this earth to make their living in the sweat of their brows, unhindered by government and unaided by government. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not found anything to the contrary. I wanted to reply this morning, if I could have obtained the time, to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but the time was necessarily given up so that I could not do that. I have had the opportunity only to set Mr. Jefferson right, if a mere pigmy like myself could speak of "setting" a great man like that "right," and if my fellow-pigmy, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], could by any possible missile which he could hurl hurt a character like that. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] There never will come a time when every dart cast at him will not fall hurtless from his shield, because he was, next to one other man, who was more than man, the greatest democrat that ever lived. I do not speak in a partisan sense. I mean, socially and otherwise, a world democrat. I mean by that the greatest lover of mankind and the most ardent and consistent lover of an equal opportunity for all the sons and daughters of men upon the surface of this earth.

My friend gets up this morning and refers to the Democratic campaign book, and shows you pictured thereon the Republican elephant with its legs all plastered over with "trusts," and he says, "How could you make the elephant go faster by cutting off his legs?" The gentleman seems to have made a mistake. We do not want to make the elephant go faster. It has gone too fast already. It is going too fast now. It is trampling upon too many precious rights, stamping individualism out of existence. We want to make it go slower, and, for my part, I only see one way to make it go slower, and that is to cut off its legs containing all these trust muscles in them. The gentleman seems to imagine that the elephant is the country. Not a bit of it. The elephant is merely the Republican party, in my opinion somewhat of an enemy of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I will take some other occasion to reply to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because it seems to be directed toward me, and

shall insert Mr. Jefferson's letter in full in the RECORD, in order that there may be no question in any man's mind—Democrat or Republican—that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is totally wrong and I right about its real meaning. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MONTICELLO, January 9, 1816.

TO BENJAMIN AUSTIN, Esq.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of December 21 has been received, and I am first to thank you for the pamphlet it covered. The same description of persons which is the subject of that is so much multiplied here too, as to be almost a grievance, and by their numbers in public councils have wrested from the public hand the direction of the pruning knife. But with us as a body they are republican and mostly moderate in their views; so far, therefore, less objects of jealousy than with you. Your opinions on the events which have taken place in France are entirely just, so far as these events are yet developed. But they have not reached their ultimate termination. There is still an awful void between the present and what is to be the last chapter of that history; and I fear it is to be filled with abominations as frightful as those which have already disgraced it. That nation is too high minded, has too much innate force, intelligence, and elasticity to remain under its present compression. Samson will arise in his strength as of old, and as of old will burst asunder the withes and the cords and the webs of the Philistines.

But what are to be the scenes of havoc and horror, and how widely they may spread between brethren of the same house, our ignorance of the interior feuds and antipathies of the country places beyond our ken. It will end, nevertheless, in a representative government, in a government in which the will of the people will be an effective ingredient. This important element has taken root in the European mind, and will have its growth. Their despots, sensible of this, are already offering this modification of their governments as if of their own accord. Instead of the parricide treason of Bonaparte, in converting the means confided to him as a republican magistrate to the subversion of that Republic and erection of a military despotism for himself and his family, had he used it honestly for the establishment and support of a free government in his own country, France would now have been in freedom and rest, and her example operating in a contrary direction, every nation in Europe would have had a government over which the will of the people would have had some control. His atrocious egotism has checked the salutary progress of principle and deluged it with rivers of blood which are not yet run out. To the vast sum of devastation and of human misery of which he has been the guilty cause much is still to be added. But the object is fixed in the eye of nations, and they will press on to its accomplishment and to the general amelioration of the condition of man. What a germ have we planted, and how faithfully should we cherish the parent tree at home!

You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more candor; but within the thirty years which have since elapsed how are circumstances changed! We were then in peace. Our independent place among nations was acknowledged. A commerce which offered the raw material in exchange for the same material after receiving the last touch of industry was worthy of welcome to all nations. It was expected that those especially to whom manufacturing industry was important would cherish the friendship of such customers by every favor, by every inducement, and particularly cultivate their peace by every act of justice and friendship. Under this prospect the question seemed legitimate whether, with such an immensity of unimproved land, courting the hand of husbandry, the industry of agriculture or that of manufactures would add most to the national wealth? And the doubt was entertained on this consideration chiefly, that to the labor of the husbandman a vast addition is made by the spontaneous energies of the earth on which it is employed; for one grain of wheat committed to the earth she renders twenty, thirty, and even fifty fold, whereas to the labor of the manufacturer nothing is added.

Pounds of flax, in his hands, yield, on the contrary, but pennyweights of lace. This exchange, too, laborious as it might seem, what a field did it promise for the occupations of the ocean; what a nursery for that class of citizens who were to exercise and maintain our equal rights on that element? This was the state of things in 1785, when the "Notes on Virginia" were first printed; when, the ocean being open to all nations, and their common right in it acknowledged and exercised under regulations sanctioned by the assent and usage of all, it was thought that the doubt might claim some consideration. But who in 1785 could foresee the rapid depravity which was to render the close of that century the disgrace of the history of man? Who could have imagined that the two most distinguished in the rank of nations for science and civilization would have suddenly descended from that honorable eminence, and setting at defiance all those moral laws established by the Author of nature between nation and nation, as between man and man, would cover earth and sea with robberies and piracies merely because strong enough to do it with temporal impunity; and that under this disbandment of nations from social order we should have been despoiled of a thousand ships, and have thousands of our citizens reduced to Algerine slavery. Yet all this has taken place.

One of these nations interdicted to our vessels all harbors of the globe without having first proceeded to some one of hers, there paid a tribute proportioned to the cargo, and obtained her license to proceed to the port of destination. The other declared them to be lawful prize if they had touched at the port, or been visited by a ship of the enemy nation. Thus were we completely excluded from the ocean. Compare this state of things with that of 1785 and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we did not then believe, that there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed or rather assumes a new form. Shall we make our own comforts or go without them, at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns.

I am not one of these; experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort, and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign when an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not soon have a supply at home equal to our demand and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has wielded it. If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply, the question of 1785 will then recur. Will our surplus labor be then most beneficially employed in the culture of the earth or in the fabrications of art? We have time yet for consideration before that question will press upon us, and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist, for in so complicated a science as political economy no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances, and for their contraries. Inattention to this is what has called for this explanation, which reflection would have rendered unnecessary with the candid, while

nothing will do it with those who use the former opinion only as a stalking horse to cover their disloyal propensities to keep us in eternal vassalage to a foreign and unfriendly people.

I salute you with assurance of great respect and esteem.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor for the purpose of discussing at any length the question made and presented by the gentleman from Georgia in relation to the comparative prices of American manufactured goods sold in the United States and sold abroad. The question is a very old one. I was greatly surprised when the Democratic national Congressional committee put forth with so much appearance of self-satisfaction statements which have been read and commented upon by their author. It was not a new question, and he has not said a single new word about it. It has been thrashed out on this floor on each recurring discussion of the tariff problem since I, at least, have been a member of this House, which began in 1835.

At the time of the pendency of the McKinley bill we had an elaborate discussion of it, and big catalogues—they are very familiar to me—just such catalogues as the gentleman has paraded here, were brought by a gentleman by the name of Mansur, from Missouri, and all the same statements were made. It was during that year that I had occasion to look into the matter definitely and distinctly.

During the fall following the discussion on that bill I wrote letters to a number of the leading consuls and consuls-general in Europe, several of them, and received from them full statements that threw light on the question; and I take the floor on this occasion to ask unanimous consent of the House that I may republish those statements. One of them was made by a gentleman who is now consul-general at Frankfort. He entered the consular service abroad in 1877 and has been there ever since. Another was consul-general at that time at Berlin, Mr. Mason, having been at that time at Frankfort on the Main. Another is a letter from an operator in machinery with his headquarters at Frankfort; and they throw abundant light upon this whole question.

I may say very briefly that there is no manufacturer in the United States that has been able to continue his business for five years, nor merchant at the head of any considerable line of business that is not doing every year of his life just exactly in principle what the gentleman has complained of in our manufacturers of the United States. You may go to the leading stores in the city of New York in the months of May and June, and a price will be placed upon a certain line of goods. You may go to the same store in September and October, and there is a reduction of 25 to 50 per cent on that particular line of goods. You may do the same thing with the manufacturers in the great leading lines of production in the United States; and they do not sell their surplus manufactures among their customers.

It would be folly for a merchant in the same town, in the country, when he is forced to make a reduction incident to the changing seasons and fashions, to sell his goods to the same customers who will come for their fall supplies to him. The same tactics—if that is the proper word—the same policy is used by our manufacturers in disposing of their surplus production. And in that way, and that way only, with a single exception, which I will refer to, our trade abroad has been enormously increased. It is very true that in some lines goods manufactured in the United States have been introduced into Europe at a cost below the cost of production. I was told by a gentleman connected with the manufacture of wire nails that at the close of the first year of their attempt to gain the markets of Europe it had cost his organization a million dollars that year to pay the difference between the cost of production and the price they had sold the goods at abroad. Yet that was a good business transaction. It was the introduction into a foreign market of a new line of goods. Since that time it has grown in monstrous proportion, to the benefit of the laborer of the United States.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent of the House, I attach the documents to which I have referred. I presented this same material during the last campaign in a speech I had the honor to make at Marion, Ind., and so I quote here the introductory paragraph of that speech and the concluding summary thereof:

The Democrats say that the products of these trusts are being sold in Europe and other markets for less money than they are being sold in the United States. I had occasion a long time ago to study this question, and I did it very thoroughly. This is not a new question; it is not a discovery nor even an invention at this time. Long ago in the House of Representatives, to wit, in 1891, this subject was brought to the attention of the House by one of the able members of the Democratic party, Mr. Mansur, of Missouri, and he produced the same startling array of facts, as he called them, that are now being paraded by the Democratic national committee.

INDISPUTABLE TESTIMONY.

I can not better answer the whole subject than by publishing here to-day some letters which came to me in answer to interrogatories which I sent, under the fire of that Congressional debate, to certain gentlemen in Europe whom I knew would be able to discuss intelligently the whole business. I had spent considerable time in Europe during the summer of 1891, and I append to the introduction of the letters which discuss this question a few words

explanatory of how they came into my possession, as well as the letters themselves. I sent letters of inquiry to Frank Mason, consul-general of the United States at Frankfort-on-the-Main, a gentleman of high character, known to everybody in the northern part of Ohio, a man who has been twenty-five years connected with the consular service, was retained by reason of his high character and efficiency by Grover Cleveland during his term, and is to-day one of the most efficient of our foreign consuls. I also append a letter from W. H. Edwards, consul-general at Berlin, one of the clearest-headed and brightest men that the United States has sent abroad. I furthermore attach a statement of an American gentleman who for many years has dealt in all these articles at Frankfort, himself a Bostonian by birth and residence, and who makes the whole matter absolutely clear; and in this connection I append a letter written by me from London to Wilbur F. Wakeman, secretary of the American Protective Tariff League, New York, dated September 2, 1891, when I had the fullest knowledge of the facts and before I knew that Governor Campbell would introduce the subject into the campaign of 1891.

LONDON, ENGLAND, September 2, 1891.

WILBUR F. WAKEMAN,

Secretary American Protective Tariff League, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Information has reached me from the United States that the old story which was so thoroughly and so effectively ventilated and repudiated in the progress of the debate on the McKinley bill in Congress in relation to our manufacturers selling their goods in Europe at a less price than they sell them in the United States is being again industriously circulated with the hope of affecting unfavorably to the protectionists the elections pending in the United States. As I understand it the claim is made that from the list price, as published by our manufacturers and exporters, a larger discount is made abroad than is made at home.

During the two months of my stay in Europe I have taken a great deal of pains to ascertain the exact facts in relation to this matter, and have, moreover, asked for information on the subject from three gentlemen best capable, in my opinion, of all Americans in Europe to give exact facts, and I therefore furnish to you the letter of Mr. Larrabee, a distinguished American business man, for many years doing business in American products in Germany, and I also furnish the letter of Mr. Consul-General Mason, who has had long experience and whose integrity as a man will not be questioned by anyone who knows him, and the two letters of Consul-General Edwards, one of the most distinguished and capable men in the consular service of the United States abroad. This seems to be all there is of this matter, and like most of the arguments against a protective tariff falls to the ground upon investigation.

It may be true, as here intimated, that certain American manufacturers, in their great zeal to secure European markets to bushels of wheat and barrels of pork, figuratively speaking, have been willing to make sacrifices to secure an entree into the European market, but these cases have been exceedingly rare, and in point of fact the American producer has been more content than it would seem wise in him to treat the foreign market as though it required the same article that is required by the American.

As a matter of course, there is a wide difference between the demand in Europe and the demand in America for almost every quality of manufactured article—I speak especially for those portions of Europe outside the British Isles. Their railroad trains would not be tolerated a moment in the United States, and so of very many other matters about which I might speak, but the mere suggestion to a man who has observed it is quite sufficient.

I sum up from observation, investigation, knowledge, and the testimony of the witnesses which I here present that there is absolutely less than nothing in the whole of the story.

C. H. GROSVENOR.

CONSUL-GENERAL MASON'S LETTER.

Following are the letters to which General GROSVENOR referred in his letter:

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Frankfort-on-the-Main, August 14, 1891.

C. H. GROSVENOR,

St. Gallé, Switzerland.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your note of the 11th instant, inclosing a letter from the American Protective Tariff League to you on the subject of export discounts. The letter states that it is asserted by free-trade orators and journals in the United States that certain exporters there give much more liberal discounts to foreign importers than they grant to home purchasers. This, if true, would tend to prove that American manufacturers are so highly protected by the present tariff that they can afford to sell their products to foreign buyers at prices considerably below those which they demand from American purchasers. You ask me to give the results of my experience and observation in respect to this subject and I gladly comply.

By "discounts" is understood, of course, the reduction which a manufacturer or dealer makes from his list or catalogue price in making terms with the purchaser. The practice of making and printing a schedule or catalogue of high prices in dollars and negotiating sales by discounts from such list is an American invention and was first practiced in the United States. Its object is to enable the jobber or retailer to sell goods at the apparent price of the manufacturer, as shown by the list or catalogue of the latter, thereby concealing the profit of the jobber or retailer, which consists in the discount which the manufacturer has conceded from his list prices. This practice was afterwards adopted by English exporters who came into competition with those of our own country in foreign markets. Many manufacturers have list prices so high that they can grant discounts of 30, 40, 50, and even 60 per cent and still retain a profit on their goods sold. Whether an exporter sells actually for a high or low price depends, therefore, not upon the percentage of discount which he allows, but upon his list or schedule, which forms the basis of the transaction. In some lines of trade these lists are uniformly from 80 to 100 per cent above the net market value, so that large discounts look formidable, but, in reality, mean very little.

We come now to the main question, whether American exporters habitually or to any important extent give heavier discounts to foreign than to domestic purchasers. My own belief, confirmed by long observation and experience, is that they do not. During my twelve years' experience as consul in Switzerland, France, and Germany I have often tried to introduce certain kinds of American manufactured goods by inducing merchants or consumers in my district to give orders upon American terms. This was done, of course, from no personal or pecuniary motive, but for the purpose of extending American trade abroad. The principal difficulty which I have always encountered has been the rigid adherence of American exporters to their price lists, their refusal to grant any special concession either in price, terms of payment, or conditions of packing and delivery. With few exceptions they have seemed wholly indifferent to foreign trade, and wished to use it only as a dumping ground for their surplus products at times when the market was dull at home. Not only this, but in more than one instance when I had persuaded a foreign dealer to order goods from an American exporter, during times of depression in the United States, the said exporter would ignore continued orders from the same dealer as soon as an improvement in the American market enabled him to sell all his product at home.

Still further, the goods sent abroad by American exporters are in very many cases the refuse of their stock, the obsolete or imperfect wares which they can not sell readily at home. And I think it will be found that wherever an American exporter has given an unusual discount to a foreign buyer there has been some defect in quality to justify such reduction in price. It is just this unreadiness of American exporters to make liberal concessions in order to establish a foreign trade which makes foreigners say of us as a people that we are great manufacturers and home traders, but we are not "merchants" in the large English sense of the term. On the other hand, I have met many proofs that European exporters do constantly and habitually make extraordinary discount to American buyers.

In the matter of silk goods, aniline, velvets, and several other classes of merchandise, I have long been accustomed to scrutinize closely invoiced values and detect undervaluations. As a basis of such supervision I have been obliged to study carefully local market values; that is, the wholesale selling prices. The uniform excuse of the shippers is that there is in nearly every line of export trade a lower schedule of prices for the American trade. They say in effect that "the Americans are large buyers; they want the best goods we can make, and pay promptly; every European exporter, therefore, prefers American to any other foreign buyers, so that competition for the American trade is fierce and constant. And so, since the importers over there have to import through a high tariff, we meet them halfway and give them especially low prices and liberal terms."

No one will probably deny that in this policy the European exporters show good business judgment and common sense. Neither would any intelligent person ascribe such good judgment to the effects of the power which may happen to prevail in the country where he lives. In fact, the import tariff has nothing to do with the matter. The manufacturers of Switzerland, which country collects only a nominal import duty upon anything, are just as willing to grant liberal discounts to American buyers as are those of France, Germany, or Italy, which impose high import duties upon many classes of articles.

Ask the import buyers of leading New York firms like Mills & Gibb, E. S. Jaffray & Co., and Field, Leiter & Co., of Chicago, and they will tell you that they can buy almost any kind of manufactured goods at the place of production for prices lower than are charged to the jobbing or retail trade in Europe.

The more deeply this question is studied the more clear it will appear that if there is any advantage in respect to export discounts it is the consumers of the United States and not those in foreign countries who have the principal benefit of it.

FRANK H. MASON, *Consul-General.*

CONSUL-GENERAL EDWARDS'S LETTERS.

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Berlin, August 14, 1891.

C. H. GROSVENOR.

MY DEAR SIR: The contents of the communication inclosed with yours of the 11th caused me no surprise. Whilst I am unable to deal with the details of the case mentioned by your correspondent, I am not ignorant of certain facts which may have an important bearing on the question.

You do not need to be told whether the manufacturers engaged in the practical solution of the important question, their export trade, are justified in giving to the wares manufactured for export the finish demanded by foreign consumers and foreign customs requirements. The manufacturers of other countries have, in many instances, succeeded so closely in copying our wares without imitating the rich and luxurious finishing process as to force our manufacturers, in order to obtain or retain a fair share of the trade of any foreign country, to vary or modify the finish to suit the tastes of the foreign people or to meet the demands of competition.

Everyday experience shows our foreign manufacturers that the best article, according to their standard, is not always most acceptable and most salable to foreign consumers. Our people want, our market demands in every instance in respect of almost every article of commerce and trade, a very highly polished or very luxuriously finished article.

The foreigner, as a rule, does not see the necessity for the luxurious or highly finished and considers the roughly finished work quite as useful for his purpose. He does not see why copper tubes should be made or finished with nickel plate. He demands the plain, less expensive article—an article that the American manufacturer, for the credit of his house at home, would not turn out for home consumption. Wherever exporters have been able to establish a footing on foreign soil for our manufactured wares it has been through varying or modifying their manufactures to suit foreign tastes and to meet the requirements of foreign customs laws.

In disposing of these wares for foreign account the difference in the cost of finish is frequently accounted for in the discount rate allowance and not in the price. In other words, the broad answer to the argument is that the wares sold for export are manufactured for foreign account and are not of the same grade, quality, style, or finish as those manufactured and sold for home consumption, and that the market demands are not the same. Our expensive finishing processes are not regarded as indispensable nor even desirable by many foreign consumers.

Many American manufacturers, after much struggling and hesitation, have at last resorted to stifle their scruples upon this subject, and I must say that in my opinion the sooner they outgrow the pride which sticks to the rich finish the sooner will they secure a sound footing in the foreign market. Take the case of one of the industries of our State. The Dayton Cash Register Company have established in this city an agency for the sale of their machines, which are beautifully finished in nickel plate. The machines are sold at about \$200 each, and I am quite sure that the plain machine, without the elaborate and costly finish, could be put on this market for \$50.

I am equally sure that if the American manufacturers do not make the change required by these economical people, the want will soon be supplied by the German manufacturers and the expensive American machine driven from the market. The clear-headed exporter would manufacture a machine specially adapted to the wants, tastes, and economical habits of these people, and of course he could sell it at a 60 per cent discount, because it cost far less than the American market machine.

There is another point to which I desire to invite your attention. Many articles are subjected in different foreign countries to a special system of customs duty taxation. To illustrate, take the case of the German customs tariff on carriages, sulkies, surreys, victorias, and everything in the vehicle line. Our manufacturers have adopted what they represent as their standard vehicles in every class.

The bodies, gears, wheels, and shafts are all painted and striped certain colors and styles which seem indispensable to the American manufacturers, because the home trade demands it. Then they add their rubber side-curtains, their automatic pads, their rich and stylish linings, etc., until they have a vehicle which they think meets the demands of our markets, and, therefore, should be accepted everywhere. If those same manufacturers would consult the requirements of the customs laws of foreign countries they would find that, owing to the special system of customs duty taxation in force in many foreign countries the rates of duty on the rich linings, the automatic pad, the rubber side curtains, the luxurious canopy, the standard

colors, etc., make it practically impossible to export such wares with profit. The truth is, the vehicles, when completed according to the American manufacturers' standard, carry so many high-duty articles under the foreign system of taxation that it is not profitable to export them. Why not drop a pad, or a side curtain, or a canopy if it gives you profitable entrance to the foreign market? Naturally the experienced exporter who has taken the pains and precaution to consult the provisions of foreign tariffs and has learned the wishes of foreign consumers, manufactures and sells the article they want, having finished it in the most practicable way to meet the customs tariff of the country to which it is exported.

That is the manufacturer who is making the discount allowance of 60 per cent, and he can afford to do so, as it is an entirely different article from that sold to the home trade. Every American manufacturer who desires to become an exporter and who hopes to compete successfully in the foreign markets, should study well the customs laws of foreign countries and shape their export wares in a way that will enable them to meet in a profitable manner the demands of foreign customers. They should give up their pride of standard style and finish whenever the effect is to keep their goods out of the foreign markets.

You can rest assured that every important exporter of this country has a copy of the McKinley tariff measures in his possession, and, what is more, he understands every provision which touches his business quite as well as he understands his Bible. It is the only way to deal with the foreign trade, and I am quite sure that you will find upon investigation that the 60 per cent discount allowance was made because the manufacturer could benefit to that extent some change made in the finish or manufacture of an article for foreign consumption. I think you will find my argument sound and sustained by facts. It is not the same article in every respect that is sold for the home trade.

W. H. EDWARDS.

POTSDAM, August 16, 1891.

DEAR GENERAL GROSVENOR: Yesterday I stated at length my views in the matter of the difference in the discount allowed between our home trade and the foreign market, still I can not help thinking that a little further explanation is advisable in the matter. My contention is that the granting of the difference in the discount allowance may be fully accounted for in every case by the difference in the quality, style, and finish of the articles intended for the export trade. To my personal knowledge American export trade has heretofore suffered to a very serious extent because the American manufacturers would not vary or modify the standard of their products to meet the demands of foreign trade, and at the same time satisfy in the most practical and profitable way the requirements of foreign customs laws. The truth is, their blind position in respect of these matters has kept many foreign markets practically and entirely closed to our product. They were not in a position to successfully compete with foreign products and foreign competition until they had consented to manufacture the identical article for the foreign trade that was being sold in the foreign market by their foreign competitors. This necessitated a material change from the high standard of the products manufactured for the home trade. The truth is, the home standard was so much above that demanded by the foreign trade that our manufacturers are now able to supply the export trade with an article so much inferior in cost and appearance that they can well afford to grant a 60 per cent allowance on the price of the high standard article.

To put the matter in another way, certain clear-headed American manufacturers have, in view of the demands of the foreign markets and the special requirements of foreign customs laws, manufactured an article to satisfy known conditions to be met with in foreign markets. This article is described in the invoice in the same terms as that sold in the home market, and would appear to the trade as the same article as that sold for home account.

To illustrate: An American manufacturer of buggies, or phaetons, would not explicitly set forth in his invoice that he had dropped the rich lining, the rubber side curtains, and the automatic pads in order to sell with advantage in the foreign market. If he knew his business, he would invoice the shipment as buggies, or phaetons, and account for the difference in the standard of the vehicles—that is to say, he would account for the loss of the rich linings, the automatic pads, and the rubber side curtains by the discount allowance. Why should he publish to the world through his invoice the exact form or standard he found it profitable to ship to any particular foreign market after a thorough investigation as to the tastes of the people and a careful examination in relation to the customs tariff of the various foreign countries?

To continue with the case of carriages, phaetons, etc., the customs tariff in Germany on the naked vehicle is very insignificant, and any American manufacturer may export the unpainted and unfinished vehicle with great profit, but the very moment he is called upon to pay duty on the painted and striped article the rate is so materially changed that it makes the transaction doubtful so far as profits are concerned. When you add to that a rich lining, another rate of duty is assessed. When you add to that rubber curtains, still another rate of duty is assessed. When you add to that an automatic pad or a canopy, still another rate is assessed. When, at last, you undertake to export the standard American vehicle you have it so overloaded with high duty articles that it is virtually prohibited from entrance to any foreign markets.

The American manufacturer who has carefully studied the situation will send his naked vehicle, if that is the only profitable form in which he can introduce the article in the foreign market, perhaps with a 60 per cent discount, because it is sold without paint, without stripes, without lining, without curtains, without a pad, and without a canopy.

What is true of the carriage, buggy, phaeton, sulky, and surrey trade is equally true of other branches. I present this case because it is easily understood by the agricultural element.

W. H. EDWARDS.

C. S. LARRABEE'S TESTIMONY.

FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN, August 12, 1891.

Gen. C. H. GROSVENOR,
Care United States Consul at St. Gall.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of yesterday, with inclosure, just received. The assertion of free traders that American machinery, etc., is sold to foreigners at lower prices than to home consumers is an old chestnut that I frequently heard repeated in Massachusetts last fall. So far as my knowledge goes, it is untrue in general. I can not give you much data to go by, but advise your correspondent to call on Samuel A. Haines, No. 90 Chambers street, New York, who is either on his way home or will be next week. He has been exporting to Europe and Australia now for fifteen years, and selling the same goods in the States, and I am sure will give valuable facts which will disprove the assertion. His line is hardware and agricultural implements.

I have not imported from America in late years much except machinery, and in my case I found last fall and this spring that machine manufacturers were selling to consumers very often cheaper than for export, but no cheaper for export than to large home buyers. In 1876, when the American manufacturers of hardware and agricultural implements set out to establish

an export trade, it was argued that if by selling abroad they could increase their output they could afford to sell at a very small profit, as their gain would come in a reduced cost and smaller proportional expense account and their workmen would be employed more months in the year. To establish an export trade, therefore, the large commission houses, who made the prices for the goods, contributed their commissions and the manufacturer his profit, but it was soon found that the expenses of creating an export demand were more than the probable future profits; that to export we must compete with European labor, and rather than do that, after about four years of trial, the desire to create an export market gradually ceased. It is self-evident that we can not pay our workmen \$2 to \$4 a day and compete with foreign labor at 50 cents and 75 cents a day. While, therefore, there was a market in America, it was folly to think of competing abroad. The result of these four years spent in introducing our goods was that Germany and England copied our goods and took our market from us. This is the case also with machinery. I do not believe that any machinery is sold for export to-day cheaper than at home. Competition governs prices, and the margin at home is too small now to admit of such a thing.

One instance occurs to me of cheaper export prices than for home consumption, but the reason is clear. I import to Germany a certain make of sandpaper, an emery cloth, and get 40 per cent and 50 per cent, where the American discount is, I think, 30 per cent and 2½ per cent. The export is small because such goods are made here in quantities, and though a far inferior quality, are less than half price. On asking lately the manufacturer in New York why he made this difference he said in the States he must guarantee the quality of his goods, and in case that any proved not up to the mark, must exchange them; that he had been called upon to do this, and therefore was obliged to exercise great care in manufacturing, and, therefore, for domestic consumption, the goods cost more than goods for export. I found to my sorrow that sometimes the goods he sent me were not up to the mark, and he explained that for export he took no guarantee and had made his prices accordingly. If any goods are sold abroad cheaper they are not up to the quality of domestic consumption goods, or they are sold under a contract of large quantity, and the same quantity and quality for home use could be bought at the same prices. I do not believe agricultural machinery to-day could be sold abroad lower than it is in the States without material loss.

There may be articles that can be bought for export cheaper. I allude to patented articles on which large royalties are paid. I am aware that patentees having no patent abroad remit their royalties for a small sum for export goods. This may, on some machinery, make quite a difference, but it does not prove our patent law to be bad, for the very consumers who pay these royalties owe their existence to our patent laws.

Bismarck saw that to make Germany a great country he must adopt that which had made America great, and in the face of much opposition made the country accept protection, and gave it a patent law in 1877, and from that time dates German progress, and all thinking men in Germany now acknowledge it that their great progress in industrial undertaking, which has, in a few years, made them such powerful competitors to England, is entirely owing to these two factors. Were we to open our doors to-day to German competition our workmen would have to content themselves with what circumstances force German labor to accept—50 cents a day for their labor.

The argument that we sell cheaper abroad is illusory. Trade is governed closely by competition. The margin is too small to allow discrimination in prices between consumers. Quantity governs the price and the expenses in marketing—I speak of wholesale transactions. It is true I found some goods at retail cheaper abroad than the same goods at home. Why? Because the foreigner was content with 2½ per cent profit, and our people can not exist that way. Competition among retailers abroad is so strong that they very often sell a specialty in American goods as a leader at little or no profit, while I notice in America the retailers in one town generally agree not to slaughter their goods. Surely this is no reason why our workmen who produce the goods should not have protection against foreign labor. The commission houses in Chambers street can, as I said, give you facts, and the machine people in Liberty street will, I think, confirm my views.

The assertion first spoken of is a mischievous one, being so general, but I believe any and every instance brought to prove it would, if sifted, show a reason which would render it harmless for the purpose for which it is made. When I go home I shall pay attention to assembling data on this subject.

In the old countries—Germany, France, Switzerland, and England—Americans buy cheaper than domestic buyers, for the reason of large orders, no expense in selling, and prompt payments. He who can take the whole product of a mill gets it cheaper, no matter who he is or where from, than he who buys from hand to mouth, the world over.

C. S. LARRABEE.

GENERAL GROSVENOR'S SUMMING UP.

After reading the letters General GROSVENOR said: "A careful reading of this correspondence and a wise application of the information thus obtained to the issues now urged by the Democratic national committee lays bare the absurdity of the whole of this pretense. If I were to answer in few words the complaint I should put it in this way:

"First. The American manufacturer in the United States finds himself with a large surplus of manufactures, and, doing exactly what the American manufacturer always does, he sells his goods instead of burning them, and he sells his surplus outside of his usual and regular market. He sends them to Europe and sells them for whatever he can get. He does exactly as the American in your town does who buys his goods in the spring for the spring and summer trade; he buys them in the fall for the fall and winter trade, and when his customers are all supplied he sells his surplus at whatever he can get for it, and sells it, if possible, outside the scope of his usual and regular trade and business.

"Second. I would say that the American manufacturer is earnestly seeking new markets with the determination to extend and enlarge his trade, and is putting into the markets of the Old World new commodities, new inventions, new developments, and is forcing the markets regardless of cost. He is willing to sacrifice something to open the market hitherto unoccupied by his manufacture. There is nothing in this complaint except the wail of Democratic despair of a legitimate and intelligent issue."

The committee informally rose.

RETURN OF BILL TO SENATE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution of the Senate; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 4, 1905.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 15747) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by George A. Bartlett, disbursing clerk, in favor of Fanny T. Sayles, executrix, and others.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, the Post-Office appropriation bill carries for the next fiscal year something over \$153,000,000.

When I look back over the short period of time that I have been a member of this House and can see that the amount appropriated when I first became a member of the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads was considerably less than \$70,000,000, I am not so much reminded of the flight of time as I am of the enormous increase in the amount of business transacted in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts of money recommended by the committee for the support of the several bureaus and divisions of the Post-Office Department are liberal, some of them, in my opinion, bordering at least on the verge of extravagance. During the period from 1893 and ending substantially with the fiscal year of 1897 the appropriations made by Congress, recommended by the committee, were at least leading in the direction of the crimping of the Post-Office Department in the expenditure of money. There was, however, during that period one year in which the receipts of the Department were less in total amount than they were for the preceding year.

With the beginning of the fiscal year of 1898, business being much improved in this country, the Post-Office Committee saw fit to recommend to Congress, and Congress saw fit to adopt, a more liberal policy toward the management of the Post-Office Department. Up to 1895 the Post-Office appropriation bill contained not exceeding 10 pages. Moneys were appropriated in lump sums for all branches of the Post-Office Department. Congress found it very easy to cut off \$500,000 here and \$500,000 there in order to meet their views regarding the management of the Department.

That resulted, Mr. Chairman, in a general cutting down of salaries of postal employees whose salaries were not absolutely fixed by law. There was at that time and the preceding year a clamor throughout the country, very manifest upon this part of the Government, influences demanding not alone an increase of salary, but classification bills which should increase their salaries by statute each year of their service. I believe I speak for the Post-Office Committee when I say that the committee think it unwise to enact any legislation that shall arbitrarily promote every person in the postal service each year until he shall reach a maximum statutory salary.

So, then, some years ago the Post-Office Committee took hold of this matter, keeping the law intact as it was, segregating the various items, and appropriating directly each year for so many in each class, leaving, as you will observe, Mr. Chairman, to the executive department and to the postmasters, and ultimately for Congress, to determine how much promotion there shall be in the various branches of the postal service. That work is with this bill completed. Post-office clerks, railway mail clerks, post-office inspectors are the last to be classified and segregated this year in this bill, substantially all of which, however, has been done within the statute that has been in existence for a great many years.

The clamor for the passage of a bill classifying the Railway Mail Service has substantially ceased. The law regulating the pay of railway mail clerks is fixed at a maximum salary of eight, nine, ten, twelve, and fourteen hundred dollars. In 1885, by reason of the small appropriation for the Post-Office Department, that Department was confronted with the situation of either creating a deficiency or cutting down salaries. I think it is due to that Department to state to the House and the country that that Bureau, almost alone, has studiously refused to create a deficiency when it was possible to maintain the postal service.

As I say, they were met with this condition. They either had to create a deficiency or decrease the salaries of the railway mail clerks. The salaries were reduced—class 5 to \$1,300 and class 4 to \$1,150. Our first step was to restore class 5 to \$1,400 and class 4 to \$1,200. Then we created an intermediate class. Believing that an advance of \$200 per year was greater than the necessities of the service demanded, we created a thirteen-hundred-dollar class and an eleven-hundred-dollar class. The result of that, however, was to give men in that service more rapid promotion.

With this bill we have created a new class. I will say to the House that it is not warranted by law, but the committee was unanimous in its recommendation. In view of the dangers, in view of the hardships, in view of the extraordinary ability required for Railway Mail Service clerks, the committee thought that a class of \$1,500 should be created, and you will find in this bill that we have created a class at \$1,500 a year. There goes into that class but 225 men who will receive \$1,500 a year. They are men who have charge of two railway postal cars or more.

The result of the conference or recommendation of the committee and the action of the House has increased the average salary of the post-office clerks, and those are clerks employed in the post-office, from an average of less than \$700 in 1895 to an average now of something over \$900 a year. Last year the increase for post-office clerk hire was \$2,800,000, an extraordinary amount when you consider the increase made and the amount of the original appropriation. This year we recommend an increase of about

\$2,200,000. I believe, and I only speak for myself, that the increase is larger than a wise and conservative management of the Post-Office Department would warrant.

But as this is probably the last time I shall ever have the opportunity to address the House, particularly on the Post-Office appropriation bill, this being what might be termed my farewell address, I can not refrain from saying to those of the House who may remain as members, pledged as they are—as they can see the light—to legislate for the best interest of all, that the increase on the Post-Office appropriation bill for the next year, even admitting that times will continue as prosperous as they are to-day, should be much less than the amount contained in this appropriation bill.

In regard to this increase of salary and the complete classification of all the employees in the postal service, you must remember that the salaries of post-office clerks varies from \$500 a year, the minimum in second-class offices, or \$600 a year, the minimum in first-class offices, up to \$2,700 a year. So between that rate there is the chance and the hope of promotion in the mind of every employee in the post-offices, to furnish an incentive to him, to encourage him, to make a better official of him, with the hope that ultimately he may reach this coveted goal.

The Railway Mail Service is now classified in even hundreds of dollars—from \$800 to \$1,600; and there is the hope of promotion even beyond that to the place of assistant division superintendent at \$1,800; and ultimately the opportunity also to reach the position of division superintendent, at \$3,000 a year (a promotion which is open to those who deserve it), which your committee recommends in this bill.

There is now before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads a bill which has passed the other legislative branch providing for the compulsory promotion of all clerks who enter the post-office to \$1,000 a year as a minimum. There is not agitated now, Mr. Chairman, but it only slumbers, and will yet come—I hope not to trouble you—but there will come to Congress in the future that bill to classify letter carriers. Now, I want to urge upon the House that the word "classification" is simply a delusion and a snare as regards both of these bills. They are simply bills providing for the compulsory promotion of these employees of the Government to a higher grade.

As you all know, I have stood for some years—uncomplainingly, as a rule, bearing the burden—against the passage of the letter-carriers' salary bill, as I have against the passage of all of these bills for "classification," because the passage of any legislation of that kind must necessarily destroy the efficiency of the postal service. If you remove from man the hope and the desire to advance through his own effort, you have destroyed entirely the average man's efficiency in the service in which he is engaged. We only become proficient by reason of the hope of attaining ultimately, through our own efforts, a higher position. Now; all that the post-office clerks' bill proposes to do is to remove the incentive and promote the drone side by side with the most efficient man in the postal service.

I have said privately some years ago that I would not have seriously objected to a bill which put the letter carriers of this country on the same plane as all the rest of the post-office employees; that is, that they should enter the service at a stipulated salary, and might, through their own efforts and by proving their efficiency, advance annually at the rate of \$100 up to a maximum of \$1,200. What prompted Congress to single out the letter carriers as a special class who should be promoted by law, irrespective of the duty they performed, or their efficiency in the service, I can not tell, and probably could not have told even if I had been a member of Congress at that time.

I say here without fear of successful contradiction that this legislation tends to prostrate and destroy the efficiency of any service. A letter carrier appointed at \$600 goes to \$800 and then to \$1,000, be he good, bad, or indifferent. Be he incompetent as a letter carrier and only competent for a collector, his salary advances just as rapidly as that of the most efficient man in the carrier service.

Now, in these closing remarks that I make to Congress, I hope (and I utter these remarks only as a prospective citizen going out of public life, never to return, and having only at heart the interest of a citizen of this country), I hope that if you ever do take up the letter carriers' salary bill you will strike from the present statute that provision which promotes compulsorily every one of these officials annually. I believe that that law to-day is costing us through an inefficient service \$5,000,000 annually, which will continue to increase as the service increases. You can see it yourself. You have removed the incentive for a man to excel. He only has to do just sufficient to keep him in the service.

The Post-Office Committee, I think, should be congratulated by the House of Representatives that it has steadily recommended against an encroachment of this character upon the efficiency of the public service; that it has steadily stood against these so-called "classification" bills, which are but compulsory promotion bills. That committee has stood steadily against

these measures up to the present hour, and I say again I hope Congress will never remove that bar; that it will at all times have in view an efficient service for the best interests of the people, which can only be obtained by holding out to man the hope of promotion through his own efforts.

I did desire to call the attention of the House at length, but will do so only in passing, to the increase in certain items in the Post-Office appropriation bill. Some years ago we had considerable agitation in Congress about the enormous increase in the amount of money paid to railroad companies for the transportation of mail. That question was, I think, substantially determined, at least for a time, or the agitation checked, by the report of the commission appointed to investigate that subject.

If anyone will take the time to look at the increase of the various items in the postal service, he will see that where the increase is left discretionary, substantially, in the Post-Office Department, it is abnormal, but where the increase comes from contract service or from a service similar to the transportation of mail, whereby the increased amount of business done decreases the pay per pound, then the increase, if anything, is below the normal.

It will be found that the increase in the Post-Office clerk hire since 1897, including the fiscal year of 1904, has been more than 80 per cent, while the increase in the amount of money paid to railroads for the transportation of mail for the same period has been but 30 per cent. Take it all through the Post-Office appropriation bill and single out the character of work that is done by competition, by contract, and it will be found that while we are getting a good service the increase during that same period has varied but very little from 25 to 30 per cent.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the time which has been fixed for general debate is about to expire, and I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the committee be allowed such time as he desires in order to finish.

The CHAIRMAN. The order having been made in the House, it is not competent for the committee to extend the time. The Chair will state that the gentleman has fourteen minutes remaining.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I was watching the clock and am very nearly through. There is one other subject to which I wish to direct attention, and I do it somewhat in the line of regret. When I was a boy I used to hear an expression, and do once in a while now in my own country, that if a man's foresight was as long as his hindsight he would be a wonderful man. I regret, and I think Congress, when it contemplates and investigates, will have serious cause to regret, that the rural free-delivery service was not placed with our contract star-route service, or, I might say, in the department of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

If you will take the time to read the hearings before the Post-Office Committee and see how extensive the free-delivery service has grown under star routes, with a very trifling increase in expenditure, those of you who will be here a few years from now, appropriating from forty to fifty millions of dollars a year for rural free delivery, will then have ample time and cause to regret not having placed under the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, in conjunction with the star-route service which is now being most excellently carried out by him, this Rural Free-Delivery Service, which is the most extravagant bureau ever organized in any government service.

When we but contemplate that the expenses in the Post-Office Department here in Washington alone for the management of that service is as great as the total expenditure for the management of the whole bureau of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, we have cause to wonder whether we have not gone a little too fast in respect to rural free delivery. Some one may ask why I have not given my effort to the curtailing of expenditures.

Fortunately or unfortunately, that branch of the service is not under the control of the Post Office Committee. That part of the service is managed by the Committee on Appropriations. The salaries are extravagant, the number of employees is more than double what it should be. That no man can question. It costs nearly \$700,000 for a field service. Now, it might be asked why we did not cut that down. We have pared off wherever we dared to.

The Post-Office Committee has realized what every other observing man has realized—that when you touch the rural free-delivery service it would seem that the very service itself depends upon John Smith or Tom Jones getting a large salary for doing nothing, and the Post-Office Committee has recommended no more than they feel the House will sustain them in. I may say in passing that we have made the only cut in the rural free-delivery service which has been attempted to be made by the House of Representatives.

I do not know that I have anything further to say, and am willing that the bill should now be read under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For separating mails at third and fourth class post-offices, \$1,300,000.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I wish to offer an amendment to come in at the end of line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, at the end of line 21, add the following:

"For clerk hire for third-class post-offices not entitled to an allowance for separating the mails, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster-General in the disbursement of this appropriation shall not allow more than \$300 per year to any postmaster, and shall make allowance only to those postmasters who devote their entire time to the duties of their office."

Mr. LOUD. I make the point of order against that provision that it is new law, that it provides for the employment of clerks in offices not under existing law entitled to clerk hire. Clerks are only allowed under existing law in first and second class post-offices.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that lines 20 and 21 do provide for the allowance of clerk hire to third and fourth class postmasters. That paragraph reads:

For separating mails at third and fourth class post-offices, \$1,300,000.

Now, that is simply one way of securing an allowance to the postmasters of the third and fourth classes by way of clerk hire. This method, as we readily see, is an antiquated method. In offering the amendment I do not want to show a lack of appreciation of the work done by the Post-Office Committee in preparing this bill, or my lack of appreciation of their watchfulness of the United States Treasury. It may be that in view of the point of order the wording of the amendment should be a little different. Here is certainly an allowance to postmasters of the third and fourth classes, and it is an allowance for a certain purpose, and the whole purpose of my amendment is to enlarge the amount and to distribute that amount in a more equitable and just manner than that in which it is now distributed.

As it is to-day, there is a little post-office in one of the towns in my district the postmaster of which receives from the United States Government an allowance of \$200 for separating the mail simply because there is a star route which emanates from his office. A third-class post-office in the adjoining town does twice the business that this office does, but the postmaster of that office receives no allowance for clerk hire, because, forsooth, the work is confined to patrons of the office and there is no star route emanating therefrom.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. LOUD. Inasmuch as the gentleman has discussed the merits of this proposition, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of debate. The gentleman from Vermont has made an insidious attempt to provide by law clerk hire for postmasters in third-class offices. I know that an official in the Post-Office Department urges such legislation. The gentleman referred to a fourth-class office that gets \$200 per annum for separating purposes. Then he referred to a third-class office that does a great deal more work, that does not have any allowance.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the payment to the postmaster is based upon the amount of work that is done in that office. The object of allowing money for separating purposes (and that is in accordance with the law) is that the postmaster is required to handle mail from which he can not possibly receive any returns, and the returns are what makes his own salary. I have heard an official in the Post-Office Department say that any postmaster who devotes all of his time to the duties of a third-class post-office ought to have clerk hire. Well, the pay of a postmaster in a third-class office varies from one thousand to nineteen hundred dollars a year.

Take an office that the gentleman evidently had in view, a \$1,700 or \$1,800 office. The postmaster is paid \$1,700 or \$1,800 for the work that legitimately belongs to that office, not as a salary to him alone, because if you were to compensate postmasters in towns of 1,500 or from 1,000 to 2,000 population at the rate of seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen hundred dollars and then furnish them clerk hire, the rush for postmasters' places would be greater than it is to-day, because I will venture to say that there is not a town in the United States under 3,000 population where a man can make \$1,500 a year without an investment of money.

The president of your bank, if you have a bank in a town of that size, does not get eighteen or nineteen hundred dollars a year. Now, the pay to-day is based upon the work done in the office. An eighteen hundred or nineteen hundred dollar office can be conducted by two bright young men. Suppose the postmaster should take the hog share of the salary? Let him take a thousand dollars, and he can hire a young man at \$800. There is not another position in the town in which either of them, without investing money, could make \$1,000 or \$800.

Now, the payment of postmasters is as high as it has ever been. It is enough. I had intended in the course of my remarks to call attention to this very item, which in four years has increased more than a hundred per cent. I know it is not properly used. Just as well as I know I stand here, I know that some of this money is used for the purpose of giving clerks to postmasters where there is only a nominal separation. I said to the Post-Office Department, and the Post-Office Committee sustains me, that we do not want to enact into law this provision. They said: "Well, we are doing it now." Well, if a public official wants to distribute public money without warrant of law and I can not help it, let him go on; but simply because he is taking the money and giving it to postmasters that should not have it is no reason why this House should enact legislation. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I admit the truth of the general proposition made by the chairman of the committee, but it is a fact that the third-class postmaster, who draws \$1,900 from the Government by way of salary, has to keep his office open continuously from 7 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock in the evening, and that he gets nothing from the Government by way of clerk hire. If his salary is increased by the Government to \$2,000, he becomes a second-class postmaster, and is given a liberal allowance for clerk hire. I say that it is not a just arrangement of the postmasters of this country. The third-class postmaster must keep his office open all these hours just the same as the second-class postmaster does without any of this additional compensation. He must have an assistant; he must have clerks, and he gets from the Government no recompense unless forsooth there is a star route emanating from his office. I say this method is antiquated and inadequate and it is inequitable. I am advocating this change not because the United States Post-Office Department wants it or does not want it; I am asking for it because I think it right and because my constituents believe it right.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of letter carriers in new offices entitled to free-delivery service under existing law, \$100,000.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at end of line 2, page 13, the following:

"That section 1 of an act entitled 'An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes,' approved January 3, 1887, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"That letter carriers shall be employed for the free delivery of mail matter, as frequently as the public business may require, at every incorporated city, village, or borough containing a population of 50,000 within its corporate limits, and may be so employed at every place containing a population of not less than 5,000 within its corporate limits, according to the last general census, taken by authority of State or United States law, or at any post-office which produced a gross revenue for the preceding fiscal year of not less than \$5,000: *Provided*, That this act shall not affect the existence of the free delivery in places where it is now established: *And provided further*, That in offices where the free delivery shall be established under the provisions of this act such delivery shall not be abolished by reason of decrease below 5,000 in population or \$5,000 in gross postal revenue, except in the discretion of the Postmaster-General."

Mr. LOUD. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California state his point of order.

Mr. LOUD. That it is new legislation. It appears on its face that it is an attempt to amend an act.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for the present?

Mr. LOUD. I think I can withhold it, but I shall have to press it.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I want only to suggest to the House, in advocacy of the necessity of this amendment, that under existing law cities of 10,000 inhabitants or cities where the gross income is \$10,000 now enjoy the privileges of free delivery. We have also inaugurated the system of rural free delivery. As the law now exists, we go at one step from a city of 10,000, overlooking the cities between that and 5,000, to rural free delivery; and my opinion is that the cities of this class are entitled to the privileges of free delivery and ought to have it. I regret, therefore, that the chairman of the committee feels impelled to make the point of order against this amendment. I have no doubt, however, that it is new legislation.

I concede it. This bill has been considered, passed the Senate, and has been fully reported on by the Postmaster-General and tacitly has his indorsement. He indorses the policy, but suggests an increase of 400 cities the first year, and then to include the remainder. Although this amendment, as I realize, must go out of the bill on a point of order, I want to call the attention of the House to the necessity for its passage, and hope that at some future day it may be reported, passed by Congress, and become a law. I believe it fills up a link between cities that ought to have free delivery and rural delivery, and by beginning this service it will give to the country a complete and perfect system.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this character of free-delivery service must ultimately come, but legislation of this character must necessarily be considered with some other

legislation relating to clerk hire or else it will be wholly inoperative. But in view of the enormous increase of expenditures of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year about to close and for the next fiscal year, I think it the part of wisdom for Congress to delay a year or two years, and possibly three years, the enactment of legislation of just that kind.

Mr. TATE. Will not the gentleman give us a chance to vote on it?

Mr. LOUD. At some other time.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the amendment proposes new legislation and violates the well-known rule of the House that no new legislation shall be put upon an appropriation bill, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural free-delivery service: For compensation to seven special agents in charge of divisions, at \$2,400 each, \$16,800.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "seven," in line 13, page 14, and insert in its place the word "ten." In lines 14 and 15, page 14, strike out the words "sixteen thousand eight hundred" and insert in place thereof the words "twenty-four thousand."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the committee will consent to this amendment. It provides for ten special agents in charge instead of seven, and is in line with the recommendation of the Post-Office Department. You take the great States of the Northwest—Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—and if we wish to communicate with the headquarters for rural delivery we have to go to Indianapolis, Ind., to-day. This is a service that has grown and developed wonderfully. Five years ago, when this bill was under discussion, the committee brought in a proposition prohibiting the use of any part of a little appropriation of \$150,000 for special agents.

I offered an amendment at that time, Mr. Chairman, that this should be stricken out:

Provided further, That no portion of the above sum provided for the support of rural free-delivery service should be used for any other service than the payment of carriers and horse-hire allowance.

Now, gentlemen, the chairman of the committee maintained his position and held that qualification in that bill of \$150,000 for this service, and he now comes here with a bill appropriating over \$12,000,000.

Certainly this service has grown, and while I appreciate the great service the gentleman has done to the country as chairman of the committee he so ably represented, I do believe that this is needed, that it is necessary for the service, and I hope the gentleman from California will not oppose it.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. This provision in the appropriation bill received probably more consideration than any other item in it. The committee, I believe, were unanimous in the support of the provision in regard to cutting the estimate of the Department down from ten to seven. I will say that the Department did estimate for ten division superintendents. I have always intended to be perfectly frank with the House, and I propose to do the same thing to-day.

I believe that that allowance of three additional divisions was simply for the purpose of accommodating some gentlemen in public life and not for the interests of the public service. If gentlemen will take the trouble to read the hearings on that subject they will find that there is not a division south of the Ohio River, neither did they propose to put one south of the Ohio River if they got ten divisions. You will find there is but one division west of the city of Denver, and neither did they propose to put another one there.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to say to the gentleman that there is a division south of the Ohio River.

Mr. LOUD. Well, there is one in St. Louis.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, and one at Nashville, with Mr. W. F. Conger as special agent, and we need at least two more.

Mr. LOUD. I have no doubt that the State of Tennessee could use a thousand of them. [Laughter.] And there are enough ambitious Republicans in Tennessee to fill every one of the places before breakfast, but the service does not need them. The gentleman from Wisconsin said that they had to go to Indianapolis. Why? People living in the State of Montana have to go to San Francisco to communicate with headquarters, and they would if you gave fifty superintendents.

Now, of these three divisions, they propose to put one at Boston—I believe that is already promised. I am rather of the impression that when this bill comes back from the other end of the Capitol it will contain provision for 10 divisions, because I think all these three are promised over there; I do not believe there is any left for the House. The other two were to go right in this little network of divisions—one for the State of Iowa. I do not know whether the other was to go up into Wisconsin or not.

Mr. BABCOCK. Allow me to say that Wisconsin and Minnesota have hopes.

Mr. LOUD. I think that is about all they will have. When they get through, some one else will have the cake.

Mr. BROMWELL. I read in the evidence of Mr. Machen before the Post-Office Appropriation Committee that it is the intention "to take the States of Illinois and Wisconsin out of the middle division and form them into a division." The gentleman from Wisconsin, I presume, is to get one of these if they are appointed.

Mr. LOUD. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, the committee after long deliberation came unanimously to the conclusion that the interests of the service did not demand the establishment of any more division headquarters. You are now spending for supervision of the rural free-delivery service in the field more than \$650,000, and I venture the assertion that five division superintendencies could adequately supervise the rural free-delivery service for the next five years to come, and the interests of the Government be as well taken care of as if you had 50—probably better.

Mr. BABCOCK. Just one word, Mr. Chairman. Every member of this House knows of the growing demand and pressure upon all of us for this rural free-delivery service, and knows of the difficulties under which the Department has labored to improve this service in the way that the interests of the country demand. Now, I want to say in answer to the remarks of the gentleman from California about the distribution of these places, and the statement about their being promised here in New England or elsewhere in the East, that after I had been advised of the situation I took the matter up with the Department, and said that if such was the policy I should not support any proposition of this kind.

The answer of the Department to me was that if the ten divisions were allowed they should be put where they would give the best service, and that there was absolutely no truth in the assertion that they would be bunched in New England or in the section which the chairman of the committee has designated as "right around here." Now, we all know the growing demand for this service. There are forty-five States with only seven headquarters for these special agents. I believe this is a wise provision; I believe that the growing needs of the country demand such a provision, and I hope Congress will adopt it.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that we have the pleasure of hearing from the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] on a Post-Office appropriation bill. But we have here a plea for additional officers at \$2,400 a year. Three such officers are provided for by the amendment which has been offered. Now, I want to read what Mr. Machen (probably the best posted man as to what is intended to be done with these three additional men) had to say before the Post-Office Committee in the hearing which we gave him. I asked him the question, "Where do you propose to put the new ones?"

We have seven now—practically eight, because one of those now employed in the other branch of the service in San Francisco is really acting as one of the inspectors; so that we have eight, although there are only seven distinct divisions mentioned. This is what Mr. Machen said in answer to my question:

My idea was to divide the western division and the middle division, taking out the State of Iowa and making that a division by itself.

There is one of the additional men provided for.

And then taking the States of Illinois and Wisconsin out of the middle division and forming them into a division.

There are two of the three provided for. Then, farther along, he says:

Then there is some talk of dividing the eastern division and placing headquarters at Boston.

There is provision for the third of these gentlemen. My friend from Tennessee, who already has one division—I think at Nashville—will have to wait a while on the superintendent of the free-delivery service before it comes his turn to get another. All these gentlemen south of the Ohio River, except Tennessee, will have to wait a long time before they can come in for any portion of the benefit of this amendment. It is to give Iowa one, to give Wisconsin and Illinois one, and to give Boston one. Gentlemen may just as well understand what is provided for in this amendment.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I will ask if the gentleman from Ohio will answer a question.

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I notice here in the next paragraph, on page 14, line 16, "for compensation to 25 special agents," etc. What are those special agents?

Mr. BROMWELL. We have not yet reached that paragraph.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I know, but I want to distinguish them from the men to whom the gentleman from Wisconsin refers.

Mr. BROMWELL. They are not special agents in charge of divisions, and, as I understand it, Mr. Machen intends to use them here and there, as may be necessary, as sort of traveling inspectors or agents.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do the men mentioned in line 13—those special agents—have superintendence over the ones to whom I have referred?

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes. These are the traveling or field men, as it were.

Mr. COWHERD. They are to locate the routes?

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BABCOCK) there were—ayes 28, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend in line 14, page 14, by striking out the word "four" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, against that I raise the point of order. The statutory salary is now \$2,400.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Does this appropriation bill provide, on page 19, for any increase in the salary of the division superintendents of the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. LOUD. It does, and the gentleman can raise the point of order against it when it is reached, if he desires.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I extend my very sincere thanks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from California to say the salary is fixed by law at \$2,400. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont proposes to appropriate \$2,500. The point of order made by the gentleman from California is therefore sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to 25 special agents, at \$1,600 each; 15 special agents, at \$1,500 each; 15 special agents, at \$1,400 each, and 15 special agents, at \$1,300 each, \$103,000.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 16, page 14, after the word "to," the word "twenty-five" and insert the word "thirty."

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the superintendent of the rural free-delivery service requested the appointment of 30 of these special agents, and in his showing before the committee demonstrated the importance and almost the necessity of having an additional number of special agents. The committee has reported 10 additional route inspectors, that being 10 more than were in commission last year or at the present time. The committee has not seen fit, however, to increase the number of special agents engaged in laying out the service throughout the country. The Department at this time is something like two years behind in the establishment of rural routes. In other words, a petition must have been filed with the Department for something like two years before any attention is paid to it, before any man visits the territory from which it comes and looks over the roads and inspects the conditions to determine whether or not the service should be established.

I appeal to the members of the House that this service is the only real boon ever given to the large class of people in this country who sustain our Government and who ought to be sustained and assisted by this great Government—the farming class. Among them the rural free-delivery service is the most popular of any legislation that Congress has ever established in this country, and I submit we ought to give the superintendent of this department such assistance as he requires in order that the service already asked for may be speedily established. In my own district I think there are some seventy routes nearly two years old, routes that have been asked for for more than two years and as yet no inspector has been sent to look them over and determine whether the service should be established. What is true in our part of the country is true everywhere. I submit that the recommendation of the Post-Office Department to have 30 of these special agents instead of 25, as reported by the committee, should obtain.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, all there is involved in this is a question of salary. We are informed by the superintendent of that division that route inspectors and special agents perform their work interchangeably. That is, route inspectors institute routes, as well as do special agents.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LOUD. If it is only a question.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Is it not a fact that there was an attempt at one time to make a distinction between what we call inspectors and what we call special agents, it being claimed that the inspectors were to correct defects and right mistakes of special agents?

Mr. LOUD. That is a matter of regulation with the Department.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Which are these? As I understand from a member of the committee, the distinction between inspectors and those who lay out the routes has been abolished.

Mr. LOUD. That is what we are informed; that they perform substantially the same work. Now, the theory of the Department in increasing this number to 30 was to promote a certain number of these special agents and inspectors down along the line. They proposed to cut off 19 inspectors and make them special agents. So all it would result in would be promotions.

Now, the committee thought, in view of the fact that these men had not entered the service as men generally enter the service, at a small salary, and worked up, but had entered the service at a salary of \$1,200, or \$1,400, or \$1,500, or \$1,600, very few of them having been in the service as long as three years, and many of them not two years, and some of them not more than one year, and getting on an average more salary than they would in any other branch of the postal service in eight or ten years, we thought that 10 of them were enough to promote. So you will see we provided for 25 special agents at \$1,600, being 10 more than are provided for for the current year, and then allowing the same number of special agents at the other salaries, and allowing more inspectors.

They asked that the per diem of the inspectors be raised to \$4 a day. The committee recommend that it be retained at \$3 a day, as we think a man can well afford to enter this rural delivery service at a minimum salary as an inspector at \$1,200 and \$3 a day, \$1.50 of which is salary and \$1.50 of which goes to support himself, on the average. We thought that he could afford to work his way along, \$100 a year, and go up the next year to \$1,300, and then, if he is an efficient man, the next year to \$1,400, and the next year to \$1,500, and so on up to \$1,600. These are some of the best places there are in the postal service.

Take a special agent at a salary of sixteen hundred dollars a year; that is a salary only paid to post-office inspectors, a position reached after many years of service in the Post-Office Department, and after having passed an examination so severe that I venture to assert that there are not three men in the rural delivery service to-day who could take such an examination. We think that we have arranged the matter here properly, providing for the promotion of ten men down along the whole line, and we ask the House to sustain the committee.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add that the testimony of Mr. Machen as to the salary of these special agents, on page 30 of the hearing, the first paragraph at the top of the page, is as follows:

I have always held, and I think any man who has had any experience with the postal service will say, that a sixteen hundred dollar inspector or special agent getting \$4 a day per diem has a position that is worth two thousand or twenty-one hundred dollars. There is no denying that.

That is what these 70 special agents get. That is, with the \$4 a day per diem, the sixteen hundred dollar men, the highest class, Mr. Machen says, are getting the equivalent of two thousand or twenty-one hundred dollars a year.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I could not hear all the gentleman from California said. As I understand, his position is that this is simply a question of salary?

Mr. LOUD. That is all, nothing else. Mr. Machen substantially admitted that it was a question of salary and nothing else. It makes 15 additional agents and 15 less inspectors; that is all.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. The Department asks for 30, and you give them 25.

Mr. LOUD. I know; but we give them the total number of men that they ask for, though not at the salaries they asked.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I will withdraw the amendment under the statement of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HEPBURN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 3, 1903:

H. R. 10698. An act providing for allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians of the Lac Courte Oreille and Lac du Flambeau reservations in the State of Wisconsin; and

H. R. 16333. An act to change and fix the time for holding district and circuit courts of the United States for the eastern division of the eastern district of Arkansas.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans, \$142,728.75: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 5 and ending in line 11. I know it is an unthankful task, and possibly a useless one, to make that motion.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me inquire of the gentleman, does his motion include the entire paragraph?

Mr. TALBERT. Yes, sir; from lines 5 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bounty given to the railroads which is absolutely unnecessary, and, as I understand, the Postmaster-General himself says that it is absolutely unnecessary. I know it may be said that it provides:

That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interests of the postal service.

As a matter of course, if the appropriation is made he will feel it incumbent upon him to use it and will use it. I have inquired of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], the chairman—the distinguished chairman of this committee—about the matter, and he says that he believes it is absolutely unnecessary; that it will not facilitate the mail in any way, shape, or form, and I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the railroad change its schedule; and I will ask him the further question, whether it changes it or not does it not carry the mail just the same?

Mr. TALBERT. I am informed that the mail facilities are just as good without this appropriation as with it.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is my opinion, and I have no doubt it is a fact.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that he does not know anything about what he is saying when he says it does not facilitate the mails. Are you aware of the fact—

Mr. TALBERT. I am aware of the fact that he thinks all wisdom is lodged in him, and that nobody knows anything but him. But some people know a thing or two as well as he. [Laughter.] I am giving the information that I have received from the distinguished chairman of this committee. He says that it is absolutely unnecessary, and I think the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] is about as well posted upon this matter as the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and maybe a little better.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Are you aware of the fact that we have got the fastest mail train except one in the United States for this service?

Mr. TALBERT. I am not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I did not believe you knew anything about it.

Mr. TALBERT. I care nothing about what the gentleman believes, but I believe they will get just as good service without this appropriation as with it, and if this appropriation is put in there will just be a few more free passes, and the railroad will expect a quid pro quo in return. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LAMB. Will my friend answer a question?

Mr. TALBERT. I will if I can.

Mr. LAMB. I just want to ask my genial colleague from the Palmetto State—

Mr. TALBERT. The lamb—

Mr. LAMB. The lion—whether or not he has asked the Postmaster-General if this appropriation will facilitate the mail?

Mr. TALBERT. His opinion has been received on repeated occasions. He has sent in writing his opinion to the effect that he does not need it and does not want it, but if they make the appropriation he will, of course, use it. I asked the chairman of the committee if he thought it was necessary, and he said it was not.

Mr. LAMB. I will give my friend this information, which I have obtained. I have asked the Postmaster-General this question myself: If this appropriation is discontinued, will 37 be taken off and that service denied? And he said in his judgment it would be. In view of the fact that this fast mail will be suspended unless we vote this appropriation, I shall vote for the appropriation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to ask the gentleman from South Carolina to permit this motion which he has made to come to a vote at once.

Mr. TALBERT. I have no objection whatever, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio does not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am in favor of the motion.

Mr. TALBERT. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have been sustaining the gentleman's position for fifteen years.

Mr. TALBERT. I am glad that you are right once, my friend.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is utterly useless to oppose this appropriation. It will stay in the bill, and no power on earth can get it out, and therefore I want to suggest to the gentleman to let us go on and vote.

Mr. TALBERT. All right. I am ready and willing for a vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, this provision now under discussion has been the subject of debate in this House for a number of years, although it is a thing that is the right of our Southern people. It has been frequently contended, Mr. Chairman, that the Post-Office Department, or rather the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, was opposed to this provision. Now, I think, in order that the House may clearly understand what we are to vote upon, it would be well to state the exact situation as it exists to-day. We have heretofore been making appropriations for the purpose of expediting the mail from Washington to New Orleans. This mail has been carried on what was commonly known as train No. 37. The Post-Office Department found that it was somewhat difficult for that train, carrying as it did, passenger coaches and doing ordinary passenger work, to maintain the schedule required by the Department.

After this discovery—that is, on the 2d of November last—an agreement was reached between the Post-Office Department and the Southern Railway officials and other railroad officials, making a continuation of this line from Washington to San Francisco, or, rather, to southern California—to make a special train for this purpose. The result was and is that every day, at 8 o'clock in the morning, a special train leaves the station in Washington, consisting of nothing whatever but mail cars. All the passenger traffic has been shut out, and this special train, put on for the special purpose of expediting the mail to the South, is given the right of way, and every train between here and New Orleans is side tracked in order that this exclusively mail train may have the right of way to make this schedule.

The result is that the train leaves here at 8 o'clock in the morning, takes up all the mail that comes into Washington in the morning, including the mails from New York, Buffalo, Boston, and Canada, and all the Eastern country, and such mail in transit is immediately transferred and sent to its destination. The great Sunset train on the Southern Pacific road has been changed in schedule so as to make instant connection with this exclusive Southern mail train out of Washington at New Orleans, and the result is that the mails leaving here this morning at 8 o'clock reach New Orleans to-morrow morning at 11.50, and Houston and San Antonio and other points in proportion to that schedule. Atlanta, Birmingham, Montgomery, Mobile, and other Southern centers receive their mails correspondingly earlier.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that this mainspring of the business activity of the South, costing only \$142,000, ought not to be disturbed here, after we have labored year after year for many wearisome years to bring it about, and to give thereby such great benefits to such a multitude of people.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. I understood the gentleman to say that under the old arrangement, when they carried passenger and express cars, it was difficult to keep up the schedule, but that now they have a through mail train.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BROMWELL. What was the difficulty under the old arrangement—did the passengers and the express business slow down the schedule?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; as a matter of course.

Mr. BROMWELL. In other words, you were not running a fast mail train for the benefit of the Government, but you were drawing the subsidy for the last twenty years just the same. Is that true?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that is not true by any means.

Mr. BROMWELL. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. You truly did.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. The gentleman seems to be familiar with the service, and I see that the appropriation asked for is \$142,728.75. What is the 75 cents for?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suppose that is to pay for axle grease. [Laughter.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Is it not a fact that the mail was carried under the old arrangement with the same facility and dispatch as the mail is carried now?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not by any means.

Mr. KLEBERG. It was as far as all Texas points are concerned.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The trouble with the gentleman from Texas is that he has been away from Texas for some time.

Mr. KLEBERG. No; I have been there within six months.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a statement of the Department with reference to this schedule, and they say that the mail is expedited by the new arrangement twelve hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that he may have his time extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The fact is that the mails have been expedited between here and New Orleans twelve hours actual time, and between here and Houston, Tex., the great distributing point for all Texas, twelve hours running time.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion in reference to the hearings?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. This is in reference to what the Department thinks as to whether the mails have been facilitated. If the gentleman will turn to page 57 of the hearings before the subcommittee, he will find that Mr. Shallenberger says on this subject:

We make no recommendation. I may say that the policy of the Department to exact the very best service out of this fund has prevailed during the past year and has resulted in securing a special and exclusive mail train between Washington and New Orleans on much the fastest schedule we have ever secured.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true. In addition to that, I called on Mr. Shallenberger day before yesterday in reference to this matter, and he stated that in his judgment this special train for which we are now trying to provide consisted of mail cars only and could not be had without this appropriation. That is what he said to me day before yesterday. Now, is it supposed that a railroad system running, as this road does, through a comparatively sparsely settled country, from here to New Orleans, could put on a special train and give it the right of way and sidetrack other trains in order that they may facilitate the mails?

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I have understood that some people have complained to the Post-Office Department that the schedule was not being kept and that the mail is being kept back. Is that a fact?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my friend asked me that question, because I took the precaution to get the official time-table of the departure and arrival of this train, leaving here at 8 o'clock in the morning and arriving at Atlanta at 11.50 that night.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. But, is it not a fact—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am coming to that. It is not a fact.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Regardless of the schedule, does the train make time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I have right here. Mr. Chairman, this shows that this train has maintained its schedule every day since the 2d day of November, from here to Atlanta, except in about half a dozen instances, and then it was detained in Washington by order of the Post-Office Department to take up its connections. Here is the schedule. I know that this complaint of failure of schedule has been made, but it is not true. According to this schedule, officially made, giving the date of the departure and arrival at every one of the junctional points between here and New Orleans, the train makes 50 miles an hour. That is the schedule time between here and New Orleans.

It strikes the track only in the high places, and stops at junctional points.

The train was established for the express purpose of expediting the mails. Gentlemen here from the East and West, and every other section of the country know how important it is for business men to get their mail promptly. We are expending in this bill nearly \$10,000,000 to expedite the mails by way of free delivery. That is right. I approve of it. Here is an appropriation of only \$142,000 to expedite the mail by twelve hours between here and the principal business cities of the South. I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. GROSVENOR and Mr. SHATTUC rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has one minute remaining, if he desires to occupy his time. If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless the gentleman from Ohio first addresses the Chair.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did address the Chair. I merely wish to state that I have no opposition to the amendment. If the gentleman will not make any more speeches in favor of it, I think it will go through. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHATTUC. Well, Mr. Chairman, unlike my friend and colleague from Ohio, when I get through with my speech I will still find a few gentlemen occupying their seats in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is for \$142,728. The distance from Washington to New Orleans by the route of this train is 1,111 miles. The trains run daily (365 times a year). That makes the running of this train annually 405,515 miles. It earns \$142,728. That amounts to 35 cents per mile per train one way. How they get the cars back I did not figure on.

Now, every railroad man knows that the cost of the extra speed which is required of this train should be counted at least 20 per cent higher than would be counted for the ordinary express train. Then, too, in view of the fact that the ballast on these Southern roads is of poor quality and little in quantity, the fast train is excessively expensive. Now, this train is a special. It is a Government train, unlike any other train in the United States, because of the fact that the Post-Office Department actually dictates the time—makes the time-table just as though the road belonged to the Government. Besides that, Mr. Chairman, it carries nothing but mail, as has been stated. The time between New York and Atlanta on this train by this schedule is six hours quicker; between the East and Montgomery it is six hours quicker; Mobile, one day quicker; New Orleans, one day quicker; to points in Texas and Mexico, one day quicker, and to all Southern places from six to twenty-four hours in advance of regular mail trains.

In reference to the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], that they get their mail just as quick in Texas as they used to get it, he must remember that they get it with a greater degree of regularity. I say, as an expert in this business, and I speak advisedly when I speak on the subject, if the Government of the United States can utilize this service it is one of the best investments the Government ever made for the citizens in the Southern States. It is not only of advantage to cities and villages directly on the route of this train, but we should take into consideration the great advantage we secure by having the connecting trains which run throughout the Southern country, which make connections with this special train, and those trains cost the Government nothing extra. That gives my friend from Mississippi his extra mail. It gives all of these gentlemen who do not live on the route of this particular extra train facilities throughout the South which could not be secured in any other way than by this governmental train.

Now, I say without any reservation at all, as a railroad man, that these people ought to have this extra pay if you expect them to give any such special extra service as they are giving you at the present time. To say, as has been said, that the railroads would run this train just as it is being run if the Government did not allow extra pay for the train is childish guesswork, for certainly no one here is justified in making any such statement, as no one here has any information justifying such a statement. It is a fact that a competing road to the one now running this train threw up voluntarily the appropriation and declined to run the train, claiming that the amount received as compensation did not justify the services rendered. Now, if it is such a good thing for the road that is now working under the appropriation by running the train under direction of the Government, why did the other road give up the contract? Because the benefit of this extra service goes to the Southern railways for the benefit of the Southern people has no influence with me at all, because of the fact that every section of the United States, not only indirectly, but directly, is interested. The Northern railways have not been paid extra for the reason that the immense business of the Northern railways justifies and makes it necessary for them to run special mail trains, or they would not be doing it. There is no use of paying them for doing what they already are doing.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 7124. An act to provide for the removal of persons accused of crime to and from the Philippine Islands for trial.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 14899. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Florence Crittenton Mission."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with

amendments bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 16567. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904; and

H. R. 15449. An act to increase the efficiency of the Army.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 8238. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mary Clark and Francis or Jenny Clark, deceased, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12316. An act granting an increase of pension to Weden O'Neal;

H. R. 8650. An act for the relief of the estate of Leander C. McLelland, deceased;

H. R. 11139. An act granting a pension to Carter B. Harrison;

H. R. 16564. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hunter;

H. R. 288. An act for relief of the Christian Church of Henderson, Ky.;

H. R. 9360. An act for the improvement and care of Confederate Mound, in Oak Woods Cemetery, Chicago, Ill., and making an appropriation therefor; and

H. R. 12340. An act granting to Nellie Ett Heen the south half of the northwest quarter, and lot 4 of section 2, and lot 1 of section 3, in township 154 north, of range 101 west, in the State of North Dakota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, also from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 159. An act providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers in the north one-half of the Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington, and reserving the public lands for that purpose.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill making appropriations for the Army at this time may be considered, and that we disagree to all the amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the committee having arisen informally, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, about a year ago I took the pains to investigate this special facility appropriation. I found there were 182,000 miles of railroad in this country carrying mail, and about 2,750 railway mail routes. The average statutory pay per mile for carrying mails is \$184 per year. The proposed appropriation is to expedite mails between the city of Washington and the city of New Orleans. When this appropriation was first made in the year 1893 that line of road received \$382,000 a year from the Government as the regular statutory pay, or about \$335 a mile.

The pay of that same line of roads last year, exclusive of the subsidy, was \$795,000, over \$700 per mile, while the average in the country is only \$184. The regular pay of this line has increased since the subsidy was first put on over 107 per cent. So I submit now that if there was ever any justification for this subsidy, the time has passed.

Mr. SIBLEY. Since 1893, when \$384,000 was paid, has not the railroad nearly quadrupled its mileage?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It has not. I say that \$380,000 was the pay to this road for carrying the mail from Washington to New Orleans—the identical route and the identical system over which the special-facility appropriation is to be paid now.

Mr. SIBLEY. The total compensation to the Southern Railroad, which has taken in practically all the railways of the South—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman does not understand. This is the pay for carrying the mails directly from Washington to New Orleans.

Mr. GROSVENOR. A single train.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Everybody in the country knows that the tendency in the last eight or ten years has been for the great railroads to crystallize into systems, and railroads are compelled by the march of progress to put on and maintain extra fast trains to accommodate their passenger and express business. The statement has been made here that trains on the Southern road make 50 miles an hour. I make the assertion, and appeal to the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads for vin-

dication, that the average schedule of the best trains on that road is only about 38 miles an hour.

The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, a year ago, before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, said that in the judgment of the Post-Office Department substantially the same facilities would be obtained by the Government and the people along the line of the road if this special-facility appropriation were discontinued.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the gentleman a question and an answer, to show what General Shallenberger's position is now on this question. It has been assumed that General Shallenberger has changed his mind, which, as you will all remember, in previous debates upon this subject, was shown to be as has been stated here, that if Congress appropriated for this service he would spend the money, but that he did not see that the service was going to be benefited by the appropriation. Now, I happened to be temporarily out of the committee room when General Shallenberger was given his hearing, and the particular item that was up while I was away was this special facility appropriation. When I returned I said to him:

I was not here when the item of special facilities was passed. You have not changed your mind on that, have you?

And this is what General Shallenberger answered:

No, sir. While, as I said, we do not make any estimate for it and do not recommend it, we use to the best possible advantage the appropriations made, and this year we have secured an exclusive mail train on a faster schedule than ever before.

That is what he said.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the Post-Office Department makes no estimates at all for this appropriation. There is no other road in the country, except one running out of Kansas City, that gets any special facility pay. All the mails of the great railway systems throughout the length and breadth of the country are carried for the regular statutory pay, except this line from Washington to New Orleans, a line which runs through perhaps the oldest settled part of the country; a line, as I said a moment ago, upon which the business has increased during the last nine years 107 per cent.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the regular statutory pay for the year 1901 was \$271,000 more than the statutory pay plus the subsidy in the year 1893. I do not believe any fair-minded man can investigate the history of this special facility appropriation without coming to the conclusion that it is a subsidy, pure and simple, and that the Government gets no equivalent whatever for the expenditure of the money. The Postmaster-General says that while he recommends against it, the persistent appropriation by Congress of this fund is taken to mean that Congress desires that it shall be expended, and he will continue to expend it as long as Congress continues to appropriate it.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is there any other train in the United States that is exclusively under the control of the Government except this?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This train is no more under the control of the Government than the great fast mail trains on any of the roads. It is under the control of the Government just to this extent: The Post-Office Department requires the managers of the road to furnish a schedule of the time of trains, and the schedule so furnished can not be changed without the consent of the Department, but it always consents. The schedules are made to accommodate the business of the road itself, and they are furnished to the Post-Office Department and changed when the management of the road desires a change to be made, with the consent of the Department.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Texas have both stated that the mail was not facilitated nor the time shortened under this contract. Now, let me just give one illustration of what is done. That fast mail leaves Washington at 8 o'clock in the morning. It arrives in Atlanta at 11 in the evening. There it is met by a train to Augusta, by another going to Savannah, by another going to Birmingham, Ala., by another going to Chattanooga and Nashville, and by another train.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is just one suggestion that the gentleman from South Carolina threw out that has left a false impression upon this House. I suggested to him when he was talking that he knew nothing about the matter. That train arrives in Atlanta at 11 o'clock. Every single town on the Georgia Railroad, on the Georgia Central Railroad, on the Chattanooga road, and on the Birmingham road receives its mail earlier, and every rural mail carrier in that country gets his mail earlier, and immediately after breakfast starts throughout the country with it.

There is not a farmer or mechanic, negro or white man in that country but gets his mail from six to twelve hours earlier than he did before; and yet the gentleman from South Carolina stands up and says there is no facility, no increase of facilities. That is all I want to say. I only wanted to show that the gentleman did not know anything about it.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what the gentleman has said—

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HAY. Debate has been exhausted on this paragraph.

Mr. TALBERT. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to only say a few words in reply to my distinguished friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order that debate upon this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. TALBERT. Then I move to strike out the last word.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reply to my friend, that the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Augusta says that it makes it twenty-four hours later, and you say that it makes it twelve hours earlier. Now, both of these statements can not be true; one must be true and the other must be a mistake.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will prevail. There is only one question here. If you desire to legislate for the railroads, vote for this appropriation; if you desire to legislate for the people, vote it out. That is the policy I always follow. If this train is on, which I deny—I do not believe it [laughter]—it carries the mail only to a certain section, and makes it twenty-four hours later to the great masses of the people all through the country. So I stand here as a representative of the people, and shall vote for striking out this item.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word in reply to the statement made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California was recognized.

Mr. LOUD. I move that debate upon this paragraph be closed.

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that debate upon this paragraph and amendments be closed. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the last amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina, to strike out the last word.

Mr. TALBERT. I withdraw that amendment, and I ask for a vote on my amendment striking out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment striking out the paragraph.

The question was taken.

Pending the announcement,

Mr. KLEBERG. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 80, noes 76.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Tellers.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will please take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 73, noes 87.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans., \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If my friend from South Carolina had given heed to the words of warning which I gave to him, the bill would have been twenty minutes further along on its way to passage than it now is. I have voted to strike out that proposition about fifteen times, and the result has been uniform, and to the majority of the committee always satisfactory. Now, this paragraph upon which I have now proposed an amendment stands to me to-day in a very different light from the other one. I opposed this proposition also. It is to carry the mails promptly from Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., southward down to Newton, Kans.

I was very much opposed to that, and did all I could to eliminate it from the postal appropriation bill. But I was approached on one occasion by a gentleman who took me into his confidence, and he said that there was a very unpleasant condition of politics down toward the southern hemisphere, reached by that line of railroad out of Kansas City, and he thought we ought to appropriate money enough to disseminate and diffuse the printed material that was issued in Kansas City down into Kansas. And I in a large part withdrew my opposition to the amendment. I knew

that the Kansas City Journal, of Kansas City, Mo., was a very sound Republican newspaper, and I knew that the Kansas City Star was a very able paper, for it has attacked me a great many times within the last three years very ably. [Laughter.] I thought by giving away \$25,000 of the public money we might get some light down into the State of Kansas.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I ask if the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio are germane to the amendment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman does not know better, the Chair will inform him. This is another paragraph.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We have passed that amendment; we have passed that paragraph.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am discussing the same point that the gentleman thinks we have passed. He is riding backward in one of those fast trains, looking out of the window, apparently. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHATTUC. I may be wrong, of course, but I want to leave it to the Chair to determine. Am I in order, Mr. Chairman? I say the remarks of the gentleman are not germane.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am discussing the appropriation of \$25,000 to the railroad line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio was to strike out the last word, and there is always a good deal of latitude allowed for such an amendment—

Mr. SHATTUC. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman's remarks are not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order himself, and must wait until the Chair concludes his remarks. The point of order being made, he should confine himself to the amendment before the House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out the paragraph, Mr. Chairman, which was what I intended when I rose.

Mr. SHATTUC. I will sit down, Mr. Chairman, if I am out of order, but I ask whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina was not to the same effect?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all.

Mr. SHATTUC. I am not asking the gentleman from Ohio; I am asking the Chair.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This is another paragraph.

Mr. SHATTUC. I want the Chair to tell me, so that I will have some confidence in it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. SHATTUC. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I would not if I were you. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I now begin another five-minute speech. [Laughter.] As I was saying, knowing the ability of the newspapers in Kansas City to throw light down into Kansas and thence by dissemination into Nebraska and Colorado and other points, I withdrew, practically, my objection to this subsidy amendment of \$25,000. My friend was wise, and I heeded his counsel wisely. The subsidy has been granted year after year. The newspapers have gone into Kansas, and light has broken out and results have followed, and I am in favor of keeping up the \$25,000 as long as there is any danger of the resuscitation of Populism down in that splendid section of the country. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my proposed amendment.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment to strike out the paragraph. I want to say, in the first place, that I believe with most people in fair play to all and favors to none, with special privileges to none and with equal rights to all, a precept which I have often heard from the other side of this Chamber ever since I have been here. I want to say, too, that neither the Southern Railroad, mentioned in the first paragraph upon which the committee has acted, nor the Santa Fe Railroad, mentioned in the paragraph which I have asked to have struck out—I say that both of these concerns have passed beyond the pale of infant industries and need no further protection.

I do not believe they need any special subsidy or aid. They are not asking for it. No evidence is taken by the Post-Office Committee to sustain the appropriation. Since I have been a member of this House it has not even been intimated that these roads are anywhere on record as asking for these special subsidies. The Postmaster-General said on the hearings that he did not recommend it. I do not believe they need this nursing indicated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], even of the Republican newspapers, to sustain and better the condition of the people along the line of the latter road.

Why should there be an appropriation given to the Southern Railroad or to the Santa Fe Railroad—to one of something over \$100,000 and to the other only \$25,000—to carry the mails, and this over and above that what other railroads get for like services? Why not subsidize the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad, which has the best mail train in the United States, beyond

any doubt, going from New York to Chicago? Why not subsidize the Wabash? Why not subsidize all the great railroad lines which carry special mail and have fast mail trains?

Why, the Government fixes a penalty if the mail does not arrive on time. These railroad companies which carry the mail under contract with the Government, if they are behind a certain number of minutes in their arrival at certain points, must pay a penalty, and the payment of that penalty is sufficient to induce the railroad company, if there were no other reason, to make time without any subsidy, to stimulate the onward progress of these great mail trains. No man stands more in favor of the advancement of mail facilities in this country than I do, but the most of these mail trains carry passengers and express and do a general railway business.

Some gentleman stated that these trains preceded every other train; that all trains got out of the way for them. That is a question of the management of the company. The company has a right to say which train shall precede another, which shall have the right of way. Railroads are quite ready to serve the public in such manner as the public needs require. Even now I understand one great railroad company, for the purpose of affording the people an opportunity to have coal, has withdrawn from service one of its principal passenger trains, asking that the passengers be inconvenienced for a time in order that the people may have coal to keep them warm. This is a hopeful sign, when the quasi public servants recognize their obligation to the public, and that unasked.

There is no doubt that the railroad companies are willing and ready to do the fair thing, but they are not, in these prosperous days, beggars for special sums of money for performing these services, in a measure, at least, of a public nature. I am not making any onslaught against the companies that receive this subsidy, or against railroad companies generally, but what I contend for is that if one railroad company is to be benefited in a special and an exceptional manner, then all should be so benefited. I hope that both of these subsidies will go out together. Let us have a vote upon the proposition and let gentlemen go on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COWHERD) there were—ayes 46, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of rewards for the detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, and highway mail robbers, \$25,000: *Provided*, That 10 per cent of the foregoing amounts appropriated for service in the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General may be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named, but no one item of appropriation shall thereby be increased more than 10 per cent.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, page 27, insert the following:
"Hereafter envelopes with printed addresses shall be classified in the mail as printed matter."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, on that I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the ground of his point of order.

Mr. LOUD. It is new legislation.

Mr. LAMB. This may be subject to the point of order, but I hope the gentleman will reserve it until I can make an explanation.

Mr. LOUD. I will reserve the point of order for the present.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision to so modify and change the postal law that third-class matter may be included in sending envelopes or more than one envelope out to customers from any given point. If you will refer to the fourth paragraph of section 474 of the postal laws, you will find the following provision:

A single blank or printed card or envelope, with a written or printed address thereon may be inclosed with third-class matter.

Now, a good many of my constituents who are largely engaged in various enterprises have, in the last few days, presented to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General a schedule of prices fixed by the postmaster in Richmond for the mailing of third-class matter. The postmaster at Richmond ruled against them. Yesterday, very reluctantly, the Third Assistant Postmaster-General sustained that ruling, but he informed me that there could be no objection to such an amendment as I here offer. While it may be subject to a point of order, I hope the chairman of this committee will not insist upon the same in view of the fact that these people will be inconvenienced and taxed simply because this law of last year failed to say "envelopes" instead of "envelope." If my amendment passes this embarrassment will be relieved and my constituents will be greatly benefited. I think it is a plain proposition, and I hope that the point of order will not be insisted upon.

Mr. LOUD. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if I had the time to investigate this question, or if the committee had the time, we might not be compelled to raise the point of order; but

as there are many things involved in this amendment, I feel constrained to insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That hereafter, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails quantities of not less than 2,000 identical pieces of third or fourth class matter without postage stamps affixed: *Provided*, That postage shall be fully prepaid thereon.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 29, after line 9, by inserting the following:

"SEC. 5. Whoever by violence enters a railway post-office car or any apartment in any railway car assigned to the use of the Railway-Mail Service, or who willfully or maliciously assaults a railway postal clerk in the discharge of his duties in connection with such car or apartment, and whoever willfully aids or assists therein, shall for every such offense be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years."

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I make the point of order against that that it is new legislation.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman listen for just one moment?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LOUD. There is law providing punishment for an attack on all post-office officials except railway mail clerks. The Department has urged this amendment for a number of years. I can not for the life of me see why the railway mail clerk should not be afforded the same protection that is accorded to every other postal officer. That is all there is in the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman what the purpose of this amendment is? Is it just simply to put the railway mail clerks upon the same footing as to protection from assault as the city letter carriers and other carriers?

Mr. LOUD. That is all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is clearly necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to have the amendment reported again. I did not catch its full import.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I withdraw the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LOUD. I offer the following amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add a new section to stand as section 6, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That hereafter the Postmaster-General may, from time to time, designate any officer of the Post-Office Department above the grade of fourth-class clerk to sign warrants and collection and transfer drafts in his stead, and such warrants and drafts when so signed shall be of the same validity as if they had been signed by the Postmaster-General."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LOUD. I see that there are two sections 3 in this bill. I ask that the Clerk be directed so to arrange the sections as that they may be in numerical order. It will simply require a renumbering of the sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to arrange the sections so that they may come in numerical order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD, the committee rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16990) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with amendments and with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LOUD. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded upon any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TALBERT. I move to recommit the bill with the following instruction—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Mr. TALBERT. I move to amend that with the following instructions—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the point of order that that is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman moves to amend with the following amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the point of order against that. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment. To this the gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order.

Mr. TALBERT. I move a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can not substitute a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recommit the bill (House bill 16600) with instructions to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report the bill without delay, leaving out the special facilities appropriation contained on page 22, included in the paragraphs from line 5 to line 18, inclusive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to recommit, under section 1 of Rule XVII, can be amended, but is not debatable.

Mr. TALBERT. Then my motion is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. TALBERT. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken upon ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 29, the noes 105—a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will not withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, under the rule requiring the printing a day in advance of consideration, I submit a conference report to be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That will be done under the rule.

The report of the committee of conference is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16604) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 22, 33, 34, 37, 40, 44, 51, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, and 68; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the word "heirs" and insert in lieu thereof the words "surviving children;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$474,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$94,400;" and the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT R. HITT,
ROBT. ADAMS, JR.,
HUGH A. DINSMORE,
Managers on the part of the House.

EUGENE HALE,
S. M. CULLOM,
JAMES H. BERRY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 16604, making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular appropriation service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report on each of said amendments:

The amendment of the Senate making Bulgaria a diplomatic agency instead of a mission combined with Greece and Serbia is agreed to.

The Senate amendment making the title of our representative to Siam envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary instead of minister resident and consul-general is agreed to.

The increase of the salary of the minister to Persia from \$5,000 to \$7,500, and of the secretary of the embassy to Austria-Hungary from \$2,250 to \$2,625, and of the second secretary from \$1,800 to \$2,000 are agreed to.

The provision for the secretary to Siam, who is to be consul-general to Bangkok, at \$1,800; for the secretary to Switzerland, at \$1,500; of the payment of the balance of six months' salary of the late minister to Japan, \$6,000, and to the children of the late consul at Martinique, \$5,000, are agreed to.

The provision for libraries of diplomatic officers, \$6,000, and for a new edition of the Consular Regulations, \$3,000, are disagreed to.

The consul at Santiago de Cuba, omitted from the House bill, is provided for, at \$3,000.

An advance of \$500 each allowed to the consuls at Amherstburg, Coburg, Monterey, Munich, Amsterdam, Breslau, and Sydney (New South Wales) is agreed to.

An advance of \$500 at Beirut and Fuchan is disagreed to.

The provision of \$2,000 for a consul at Warsaw is disagreed to, and \$1,000 for a consul at Colonia is also disagreed to.

A reduction of \$500 on the salary at Tamsul, Formosa, is agreed to.

An increase in clerk hire of \$600 at Hongkong is agreed to. One for \$600 for clerk hire at Monterey and one for \$300 at Naples are disagreed to, and one for \$250 at Stockholm is agreed to.

The proposed increase of \$2,000 for interpreters in China, Korea, and Japan is disagreed to.

The amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$1,944,625.69; increased by the Senate, \$39,925; amount passed by the Senate, \$1,984,550.69; amount agreed to in conference, \$1,968,250.69, being a decrease from the bill as passed by the Senate of \$16,300.

ROBERT R. HITT.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I desire to make the same request with reference to the conference report on Senate bill 4850.

Mr. TALBERT. I rise to a point of order. The point of order is that after the yeas and nays have been ordered the point of no quorum is not in order until after the roll is called.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum has been withdrawn.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I ask that the report and statement be printed in the RECORD.

INCREASED PENSIONS TO THOSE WHO HAVE LOST LIMBS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana submits a conference report and statement, which will be printed in the RECORD.

The report of the committee of conference is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 4850, "An act to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States, or are totally disabled in the same," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, and 7, and agree to the same.

On amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

C. A. SULLOWAY,
W. A. CALDERHEAD,
ROBERT W. MIERS,
Managers on the part of the House.
J. H. GALLINGER,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
JAS. P. TALIAFERRO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House on Senate bill 4850, entitled "An act to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States, or are totally disabled in the same," beg leave to report as follows:

This bill passed the Senate on April 19, 1902, and provided an increase of pension to those who, while in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty, lost one hand or one foot, or had been totally disabled in the same, from \$30 to \$45 per month; to those who lost an arm at or above the elbow or a leg at or above the knee, or had been totally disabled in the same, from \$36 to \$50; to those who lost an arm at the shoulder joint or leg at the hip joint, or one so near the shoulder or hip joint as to prevent the use of an artificial limb, from \$45 to \$60 per month; and an increase to those who lost one hand and one foot, or had been totally disabled in the same, from \$36 to \$60 per month.

On June 16, 1902, the House made the following amendments to that bill:

First amendment: On page 1, line 6, after the word "duty," insert the words "from wounds, injuries, or disease originating prior to August 4, 1886."

Second amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "forty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty."

Third amendment: On page 1, line 11, strike out the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty-six."

Fourth amendment: On page 2, line 1, after the word "joint," insert the words "or where the same is in such a condition."

Fifth amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "or are totally disabled in the same."

Sixth amendment: On page 2, line 3, strike out the word "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty-five."

Seventh amendment: On page 2, line 6, after the word "month," insert the words "and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both feet shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month: *Provided however,* That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private."

The eighth amendment was a new section, namely, section 2, and reading as follows:

"That the pensions of all persons who served one year or more in the Army or Navy of the United States, and who, under the act approved June 27, 1890, and the acts amendatory thereof, are drawing or hereafter shall be entitled to draw a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and who are or shall become so disabled from injuries or disease as to require the frequent and periodical aid and attendance of another person, shall be increased to \$30 per month from and after the date of the certificate of the examining surgeon or board of examining surgeons showing such degree of disability and made subsequent to the passage of this act."

After a full and free conference the Senate has receded from its disagreement to the House amendments numbered 4, 5, and 7 and agrees to the same, but on the amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 the committee on conference have been unable to agree.

Mr. LOUD. I insist on my motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If this motion to adjourn is adopted, will the yeas-and-nays vote come up in the morning?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The first thing in the morning.

Mr. STEELE. Let us have the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be the regular order.

Mr. STEELE. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending this motion, the Chair will submit to the House the following request of a member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GLENN, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 7166. An act granting an increase of pension to Fanny Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6968. An act granting the Central Arizona Railway Company a right of way for railroad purposes through the San Francisco Mountains Forest Reserve, in the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 7053. An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State calling attention to certain estimates of deficiency—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting record of award to Walter Grant Dygert by the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect relating to repairs of wharf at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a schedule of claims allowed by accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. B. Hutcheson, administrator of estate of Fumey Hutcheson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13074) to authorize the governor of the State of Mississippi to select certain lands in part satisfaction of its grant for university purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3540); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16946) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the coal-land laws to the district of Alaska," approved June 6, 1900, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3541); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17244) to provide for the removal of persons accused of crime to and from the Philippine Islands for trial, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3542); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 14) granting an increase of pension to George F. Howe, alias Harrington, reported

the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3484); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 532) granting an increase of pension to Merritt Young, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3485); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Matthews, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3486); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1738) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Doyle, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3487); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Chittum, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3488); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1939) granting an increase of pension to John M. Drake, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3489); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2007) granting a pension to Mary A. Everts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3490); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to William Kepler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3491); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2130) granting a pension to Margaret A. Munson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3492); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pennel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3493); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2259) granting a pension to Sarah J. Snook, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3494); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2302), granting a pension to Rose O. Crummett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3495); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2363) granting an increase of pension to James A. Capen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3496); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2439) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Larimer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3497); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2591) granting an increase of pension to George W. McComb, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3498); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2596) granting an increase of pension to Israel F. Barnes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3499); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2626) granting an increase of pension to Ardenia Dillon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3500); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2799) granting an increase of pension to Israel V. Hoag, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3501); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2936) granting an increase of pension to Berthold Fernow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3502); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2974) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Boyer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3503); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3081) granting an increase of pension to Leonard A. Norton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3504); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3249) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Scherzer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3505); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3405) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Bouslough, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3506); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3542) granting an increase of pension to William H. Shaw, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3507); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3568) granting an increase of pension to John P. Travis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3508); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3573) granting an increase of pension to John P. Post, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3509); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3574) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Bennett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3510); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3608) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso T. Gould, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3511); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3632) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Freeman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3512); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Deno, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3513); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4134) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Loughlin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3514); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4359) granting an increase of pension to John S. Milam, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3515); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4607) granting an increase of pension to Oliver G. Wright, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3516); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4752) granting an increase of pension to Betsy Jones, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3517); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4806) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Olney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3518); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid

Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5020) granting a pension to Emma D. Goslin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3519); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5040) granting an increase of pension to Stephen G. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3520); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5055) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3521); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5117) granting an increase of pension to John U. Allen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3522); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5359) granting an increase of pension to Hampton B. Farmer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3523); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5389) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Acree, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3524); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5733) granting an increase of pension to John W. Slack, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3525); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel A. Winks, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3526); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5846) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Forrester, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3527); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5850) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Whitworth, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3528); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5852) granting an increase of pension to Robert P. McRae, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3529); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5901) granting an increase of pension to Orange Sells, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3530); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5938) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. McClure, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3531); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6012) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Sears, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3532); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6066) granting an increase of pension to Edward Straub, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3533); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6276) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Russell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3534); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6338) granting a pension to Albert M. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3535); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6350) granting a pension to Inez McCollum, reported the same without amendment,

accompanied by a report (No. 3536); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6607) granting an increase of pension to Fordyce M. Keith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3537); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BULL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4577) for the relief of William McCarty Little, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3538); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5561) for the relief of S. R. Green, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3539); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16586) granting a pension to Henry Landan—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16897) for the relief of Plains Lodge, No. 135, Free and Accepted Masons, of East Baton Rouge, La.—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 17201) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Brewton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 17258) in regard to assessments on extension of Rhode Island avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 17259) to exempt building associations in the District of Columbia from taxation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NAPHEEN: A bill (H. R. 17260) to change the location of the light-house depot at Castle Island, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 17261) for an addition to the public building at Greenville, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 17262) to regulate the hours of service and compensation of attendants and nurses at the Government Hospital for the Insane, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWIE: A resolution (H. Res. 430) calling on the Secretary of Agriculture for an opinion—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 431) for the appointment of an additional clerk for the Committee on Enrolled Bills—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A resolution of the legislature of Montana relating to the shipment of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A bill (H. R. 17263) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 17264) granting a pension to Sidney Coffee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 17265) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 17266) granting a pension to Eliza J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FEELY: A bill (H. R. 17267) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 17268) granting an increase of pension to James C. Neff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 17269) granting a pension to Rachel Tyson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 17270) for the relief of Eli G. Collier—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 17271) granting an increase of pension to William K. Fowle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 17272) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Hartley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 17273) granting a pension to Oscar M. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolution of the Central Labor Union of Columbia, Pa., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONRY: Resolution of the common council of the city of Boston, Mass., asking for a light-house station in Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOVENER: Affidavits to accompany bill for a pension to Eliza J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, five affidavits to accompany bill for a pension to Oscar M. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: Papers to accompany House bill 17211, granting a pension to James M. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of George F. Wrinkle, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of J. C. Leggett and others, of Hopkins Station, Mich., in support of the McCumber bill, and in relation to the sale of liquor in immigrant stations, Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of A. H. Kennedy and other citizens of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, for 9-foot draft of water in the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: Protest of citizens of Sandwich, N. H., against the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of merchants and manufacturers of Louisville, Ky., for the improvement of the Ohio River from Pittsburg to Cairo—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of H. F. Hasselbrock and other retail druggists of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mary E. McKinnon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Resolution of Woodworkers' Union No. 7, of Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Resolution of the Progressive Caulkers and Cast-iron Water and Gas Main Pipe Layers' Union, of Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petition of Thad H. Howe, president Cigar Makers' Association, opposing any reduction in the duty on cigars coming from Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: Protest of Luzerne County Lodge, No. 153, Order of B'rith Abraham, Wilkesbarre, Pa., against the exclusion of Jewish immigrants at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of the heirs of Mary A. Hall, deceased, late of Alexandria County, Va., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Tiphereth Zion Lodge, No. 199, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Ansonia, Conn., relative to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Hartley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODS: Resolutions of City Front Federation, of San Francisco, and of the Stockton Federated Trades, of Stockton, Cal., favoring the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange and Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 10158 for the removal of discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Cigar Dealers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the reduction of duty on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.